PEOPLE OF THE WORLD, UNITE, FOR THE COMPLETE, THOROUGH, TOTAL AND RESOLUTE PROHIBITION AND DESTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS!

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS PEKING

PEOPLE OF THE WORLD, UNITE, FOR THE COMPLETE, THOROUGH, TOTAL AND RESOLUTE PROHIBITION AND DESTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS!

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1963

Printed in the People's Republic of China

CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATING THE COMPLETE, THOROUGH, TOTAL AND RESOLUTE PROHIBITION AND DESTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND PROPOSING A CONFERENCE OF THE GOVERNMENT HEADS OF ALL COUNTRIES OF THE WORLD *(July 31, 1963)* 1

PREMIER CHOU EN-LAI'S LETTER TO ALL GOVERNMENT HEADS *(August 2, 1963)* 7

STATEMENT BY THE SPOKESMAN OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT
— A Comment on the Soviet Government's Statement of August 3 *(August 15, 1963)* 9

STATEMENT BY THE SPOKESMAN OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT
— A Comment on the Soviet Government's Statement of August 21 *(September 1, 1963)* 33

SPEECH AT THE PEKING MASS RALLY, AUGUST 1, 1963, IN SUPPORT OF THE NINTH WORLD CONFERENCE AGAINST ATOMIC AND HYDROGEN BOMBS
— Delivered by Liao Cheng-chih, Vice-Chairman of the China Peace Committee and Chairman of the Chinese Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity 62

U.S. NUCLEAR FRAUD EXPOSED
"Renmin Ribao" Editorial, July 19, 1963 77

PEOPLE OF THE WORLD, UNITE! STRIVE FOR THE COMPLETE PROHIBITION AND THOROUGH DESTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS!
"Renmin Ribao" Editorial, August 2, 1963 84

THIS IS BETRAYAL OF THE SOVIET PEOPLE!
"Renmin Ribao" Editorial, August 3, 1963 91

WHY THE TRIPARTITE TREATY DOES ONLY HARM AND BRINGS NO BENEFIT
"Renmin Ribao," August 10, 1963 by Observer 97

FURTHER EXPOSURE OF SOVIET LEADERS' ACTS OF BETRAYAL
"Renmin Ribao" Editorial, August 30, 1963 111

APPENDICES:

TREATY BANNING NUCLEAR WEAPON TESTS IN THE ATMOSPHERE, IN OUTER SPACE AND UNDER WATER CONCLUDED BY THE UNITED STATES, BRITAIN AND THE SOVIET UNION *(Full Text)* 123

DRAFT TREATY BANNING NUCLEAR TESTS IN THE ATMOSPHERE, OUTER SPACE AND UNDER WATER PROPOSED BY THE UNITED STATES AND BRITAIN AT THE AUGUST 27, 1962 SESSION OF THE DISARMAMENT COMMITTEE IN GENEVA *(Full Text)* 127

STATEMENT BY V. V. KUZNETSOV, HEAD OF THE SOVIET DELEGATION, AT A MEETING OF THE DISARMAMENT COMMITTEE HELD IN GENEVA ON AUGUST 29, 1962 132

EXCERPTS FROM PREVIOUS STATEMENTS OF KHRUSHCHOV ON THE QUESTION OF BANNING NUCLEAR TESTS 136

EXCERPTS FROM PREVIOUS STATEMENTS AND MEMORANDUMS OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT ON THE QUESTION OF BANNING NUCLEAR TESTS 143

FROM CONCESSION TO CAPITULATION
—The Record of the Soviet Government in the Negotiations for Halting Nuclear Tests 150

EXCERPTS FROM KENNEDY'S RADIO AND TELEVISION SPEECH ON THE TRIPARTITE TREATY *(July 26, 1963)* 162

* * *

STATEMENT OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT OF AUGUST 3, 1963 *(Full Text)* 167

STATEMENT OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT OF AUGUST 21, 1963 *(Full Text)* 181

STATEMENT OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATING THE COMPLETE, THOROUGH, TOTAL AND RESOLUTE PROHIBITION AND DESTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND PROPOSING A CONFERENCE OF THE GOVERNMENT HEADS OF ALL COUNTRIES OF THE WORLD

July 31, 1963

A treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests was initialled by the representatives of the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union in Moscow on July 25.

This is a treaty signed by three nuclear powers. By this treaty they attempt to consolidate their nuclear monopoly and bind the hands of all the peace-loving countries subjected to the nuclear threat.

This treaty signed in Moscow is a big fraud to fool the people of the world. It runs diametrically counter to the wishes of the peace-loving people of the world.

The people of the world demand a genuine peace; this treaty provides them with a fake peace.

The people of the world demand general disarmament and a complete ban on nuclear weapons; this treaty completely divorces the cessation of nuclear tests from the total prohibition of nuclear weapons, legalizes the continued manufacture, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons by the three nuclear powers, and runs counter to disarmament.

The people of the world demand the complete cessation of nuclear tests; this treaty leaves out the prohibition of underground nuclear tests, an omission which is particularly advantageous for the further development of nuclear weapons by U.S. imperialism.

The people of the world demand the defence of world peace and the elimination of the threat of nuclear war; this treaty actually strengthens the position of nuclear powers for nuclear blackmail and increases the danger of imperialism launching a nuclear war and a world war.

If this big fraud is not exposed, it can do even greater harm. It is unthinkable for the Chinese Government to be a party to this dirty fraud. The Chinese Government regards it as its unshirkable and sacred duty to thoroughly expose this fraud.

The Chinese Government is firmly opposed to this treaty which harms the interests of the people of the whole world and the cause of world peace.

Clearly, this treaty has no restraining effect on the U.S. policies of nuclear war preparation and nuclear blackmail. It in no way hinders the United States from proliferating nuclear weapons, expanding nuclear armament or making nuclear threats. The central purpose of this treaty is, through a partial ban on nuclear tests, to prevent all the threatened peace-loving countries, including China, from increasing their defence capability, so that the United States may be more unbridled in threatening and blackmailing these countries.

U.S. President Kennedy, speaking on July 26, laid bare the substance of this treaty. Kennedy pointed out that this treaty did not mean an end to the threat of nuclear war, it did not prevent but permitted continued underground nuclear tests, it would not halt the production of nuclear weapons, it would not reduce nuclear stockpiles and it would not restrict their use in time of war. He further pointed out that this treaty would not hinder the United States from proliferating nuclear weapons among its allies and countries under its control under the name of "assistance," whereas the United States could use it to prevent non-nuclear peace-loving countries from testing and manufacturing nuclear weapons. At the same time, Kennedy formally declared that the United States remains ready to withdraw from the treaty and resume all forms of

nuclear testing. This fully shows that U.S. imperialism gains everything and loses nothing by this treaty.

The treaty just signed is a reproduction of the draft treaty on a partial nuclear test ban put forward by the United States and Britain at the meeting of the Disarmament Committee in Geneva on August 27, 1962. On August 29, 1962, the Head of the Soviet Delegation Kuznetsov pointed out that the obvious aim of the United States and Britain in putting forward that draft was to provide the Western powers with one-sided military advantage to the detriment of the interests of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. He pointed out that the United States had been using underground tests to improve its nuclear weapons for many years already, and that should underground nuclear tests be legalized with a simultaneous prohibition of such tests in the atmosphere, this would mean that the United States could continue improving its nuclear weapons and increase their yield and effectivity. The Head of the Soviet Government Khrushchov also pointed out on September 9, 1961, that "the program of developing new types of nuclear weapons which has been drawn up in the United States now requires precisely underground tests," and that an "agreement on the cessation of one kind of tests only — in the atmosphere — would be a disservice to the cause of peace. It would mean deceiving the peoples."

But now the Soviet Government has made a 180 degree about-face, discarded the correct stand they once persisted in and accepted this reproduction of the U.S.-British draft treaty, willingly allowing U.S. imperialism to gain military superiority. Thus the interests of the Soviet people have been sold out, the interests of the people of the countries in the socialist camp, including the people of China, have been sold out, and the interests of all the peace-loving people of the world have been sold out.

The indisputable facts prove that the policy pursued by the Soviet Government is one of allying with the forces of war to oppose the forces of peace, allying with imperialism to

oppose socialism, allying with the United States to oppose China, and allying with the reactionaries of all countries to oppose the people of the world.

Why should the Soviet leaders so anxiously need such a treaty? Is this a proof of what they call victory for the policy of peaceful coexistence? No! This is by no means a victory for the policy of peaceful coexistence. It is capitulation to U.S. imperialism.

The U.S. imperialists and their partners are with one voice advertising everywhere that the signing of a treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests by them is the first step towards the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. This is deceitful talk. The United States has already stockpiled large quantities of nuclear weapons, which are scattered in various parts of the world and seriously threaten the security of all peoples. If the United States really will take the first step towards the prohibition of nuclear weapons, why does it not remove its nuclear threat to other countries? Why does it not undertake to refrain from using nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries and to respect the desire of the people of the world to establish nuclear weapon-free zones? And why does it not undertake in all circumstances to refrain from handing over to its allies its nuclear weapons and the data for their manufacture? On what grounds can the United States and its partners maintain that the United States may use nuclear threat and blackmail against others and pursue policies of aggression and war, while others may not take measures to resist such threat and blackmail and defend their own independence and freedom? To give the aggressors the right to kill while denying the victims of aggression the right to self-defence — is this not like the Chinese saying: "The magistrate may burn down houses but the ordinary people cannot even light their lamps"?

The Chinese Government is firmly opposed to nuclear war and to a world war. It always stands for general disarmament and resolutely stands for the complete prohibition and

thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. The Chinese Government and people have never spared their efforts in order to realize this aim step by step. As is known to the whole world, the Chinese Government long ago proposed, and has consistently stood for, the establishment of a zone free from nuclear weapons in the Asian and Pacific region, including the United States.

The Chinese Government holds that the prohibition of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war are major questions affecting the destiny of the world, which should be discussed and decided on jointly by all the countries of the world, big and small. Manipulation of the destiny of more than one hundred non-nuclear countries by a few nuclear powers will not be tolerated.

The Chinese Government holds that on such important issues as the prohibition of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war, it is impermissible to adopt the method of deluding the people of the world. It should be affirmed unequivocally that nuclear weapons must be completely banned and thoroughly destroyed and that practical and effective measures must be taken so as to realize step by step the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, prevent nuclear war and safeguard world peace.

For these reasons, the Government of the People's Republic of China hereby proposes the following:

(1) All countries in the world, both nuclear and non-nuclear, solemnly declare that they will prohibit and destroy nuclear weapons completely, thoroughly, totally and resolutely. Concretely speaking, they will not use nuclear weapons, nor export, nor import, nor manufacture, nor test, nor stockpile them; and they will destroy all the existing nuclear weapons and their means of delivery in the world, and disband all the existing establishments for the research, testing and manufacture of nuclear weapons in the world.

(2) In order to fulfil the above undertakings step by step, the following measures shall be adopted first:

a. Dismantle all military bases, including nuclear bases, on foreign soil, and withdraw from abroad all nuclear weapons and their means of delivery.

b. Establish a nuclear weapon-free zone of the Asian and Pacific region, including the United States, the Soviet Union, China and Japan; a nuclear weapon-free zone of Central Europe; a nuclear weapon-free zone of Africa; and a nuclear weapon-free zone of Latin America. The countries possessing nuclear weapons shall undertake due obligations with regard to each of the nuclear weapon-free zones.

c. Refrain from exporting and importing in any form nuclear weapons and technical data for their manufacture.

d. Cease all nuclear tests, including underground nuclear tests.

(3) A conference of the government heads of all the countries of the world shall be convened to discuss the question of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and the question of taking the above-mentioned four measures in order to realize step by step the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons.

The Chinese Government and people are deeply convinced that nuclear weapons can be prohibited, nuclear war can be prevented and world peace can be preserved. We call upon the countries in the socialist camp and all the peace-loving countries and people of the world to unite and fight unswervingly to the end for the complete, thorough, total and resolute prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons and for the defence of world peace.

PREMIER CHOU EN-LAI'S LETTER TO ALL GOVERNMENT HEADS

August 2, 1963

Your Excellency,

The Chinese Government issued on July 31, 1963 a statement proposing a conference of the government heads of all countries of the world to discuss the question of complete, thorough, total and resolute prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons. The text of the proposal reads as follows:

"The Government of the People's Republic of China hereby proposes the following:

(1) All countries in the world, both nuclear and non-nuclear, solemnly declare that they will prohibit and destroy nuclear weapons completely, thoroughly, totally and resolutely. Concretely speaking, they will not use nuclear weapons, nor export, nor import, nor manufacture, nor test, nor stockpile them; and they will destroy all the existing nuclear weapons and their means of delivery in the world, and disband all the existing establishments for the research, testing and manufacture of nuclear weapons in the world.

(2) In order to fulfil the above undertakings step by step, the following measures shall be adopted first:

a. Dismantle all military bases, including nuclear bases, on foreign soil, and withdraw from abroad all nuclear weapons and their means of delivery.

b. Establish a nuclear weapon-free zone of the Asian and Pacific region, including the United States, the Soviet Union, China and Japan; a nuclear weapon-free zone of Central Europe; a nuclear weapon-free zone of Africa; and a nuclear

weapon-free zone of Latin America. The countries possessing nuclear weapons shall undertake due obligations with regard to each of the nuclear weapon-free zones.

c. Refrain from exporting and importing in any form nuclear weapons and technical data for their manufacture.

d. Cease all nuclear tests, including underground nuclear tests.

(3) A conference of the government heads of all the countries of the world shall be convened to discuss the question of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and the question of taking the above-mentioned four measures in order to realize step by step the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons."

In view of the urgent desire of the people of the world for the removal of the threat of nuclear war and for the safeguarding of the peace and security of the world, the Chinese Government earnestly hopes that its proposal will receive the favourable consideration and positive response of the Government of your country.

Please accept the assurances of my highest consideration.

CHOU EN-LAI
Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China

August 2, 1963, Peking

STATEMENT BY THE SPOKESMAN OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT

—A COMMENT ON THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT'S STATEMENT OF AUGUST 3

August 15, 1963

On August 3 the Government of the Soviet Union issued a statement, attacking the Chinese Government's statement of July 31 on the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and defending the treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests which was concluded by the Soviet Union with the United States and Britain. The Soviet Government of course has the right to defend its own action. However, after carefully studying this statement of the Soviet Government's, we regret to say that it is a poor defence, rambling haphazard, full of pointless talk and lacking any reasoned arguments.

I

There is a fatal weakness in the Soviet Government's statement, namely, it evades the fact that the conclusion of the treaty was a result of the abandonment of the Soviet Government's previous correct stand, the acceptance of the stand of the United States steadily upheld by two Administrations and unprincipled concessions to imperialism. The statement of the Chinese Government solemnly pointed out that the Soviet leaders made a 180 degree about-face, betrayed themselves and sold out the interests of the people of the Soviet Union and the world.

The Soviet statement is furious over the words "betrayal" and "sell-out" and asserts that there is no inconsistency in the Soviet stand, because "life does not mark time, science and technology are developing tempestuously, and what was unacceptable only yesterday may prove useful, even very useful, today." It insolently asks us who is more competent to be the judge on the question of whom the treaty benefits — "those who possess nuclear weapons and carry out tests, or those who only know about them from literature"? It appears that the Soviet leaders want to have a monopoly not only of nuclear weapons but also of the right to speak on the question of nuclear weapons.

No one can monopolize the right to speak on the question of nuclear weapons. But since the Soviet leaders regard themselves as competent to speak, let us hear what they have said in the past.

The United States put forward the proposal for the cessation of nuclear tests, excluding underground tests, for the first time on April 13, 1959. In his letter to Eisenhower of April 23 of that year, Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, called it a "dishonest deal."

On September 3, 1961, the United States and Britain issued a joint statement proposing the conclusion of an agreement on banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere alone. On September 9, Soviet leader Khrushchov issued a statement on the matter, saying that:

> Each line of the statement by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain reveals a desire, cost what it may, to ensure for the Western powers and their allies in aggressive military blocs unilateral military advantages to the detriment of the security interests of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states. . . .
>
> [It is] a dishonest deal. Of course, the Soviet Government cannot and will not strike such a bargain.

On September 28, 1961, the Soviet Government published a memorandum on the question of nuclear weapon tests, saying that:

> As to the question regarding underground and space test explosions of these weapons, it was separated from the suggested agreement and this again showed the tendency on the part of the United States and Britain to reserve for themselves the possibility of carrying out nuclear tests and to tie the hands of the Soviet Union in taking measures to improve its defence ability.
>
> To allow such a situation to develop would be tantamount to encouraging the aggressors to carry out their designs, which are dangerous for the whole of mankind.

On August 27, 1962, the United States and Britain put forward a draft treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests. On August 29 Kuznetsov, Head of the Soviet Delegation, pointed out at a meeting of the Disarmament Committee in Geneva that this draft contained a serious danger. He said that,

> The United States of America has been using underground tests to improve its nuclear weapons for many years already. . . . Should underground nuclear tests be legalized with a simultaneous prohibition of such tests in the atmosphere — this would mean that the United States could continue improving its nuclear weapons, increase their yield and effectivity, whereas the Soviet Union would have its hands bound in the question of strengthening its defence potentiality.

The Soviet Government persisted in its stand of rejecting the partial stoppage of nuclear tests. As late as June 9, 1963, it notified the Chinese Government that the Western powers' position on the halting of nuclear tests could not yet serve as a basis for agreement, and that whether negotiations could yield any results depended entirely on the Western powers.

On June 15, 1963, answering questions put by the editors-in-chief of *Pravda* and *Izvestia* on the U.S. President's speech of June 10, the Soviet leader Khrushchov said:

> As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, we are ready to sign an agreement on the discontinuance of all nuclear tests today. It is up to the West now. We agreed to a meeting between the representatives of the three powers in Moscow, to try once again to reach an agreement on this question. But the success of this meeting will depend on what the United States and British representatives bring with them to our country.

On July 25, 1963, the Soviet leaders suddenly changed their above stand, accepted the refurbished version of the U.S.-British draft treaty and signed the treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests.

The Soviet leaders say the situation has changed. When did it change? How did it change? Why is it that what was unacceptable on June 15 became acceptable on July 25, and very useful into the bargain? What changes took place within those forty days? Why did you not provide a little explanation? Why did you not give some reasons? If what you said yesterday no longer counts today, will what you say today no longer count tomorrow? You were either insincere then, or you are deliberately deceiving people now. The Soviet leaders' betrayal of the Soviet people, of the countries in the socialist camp and of the people of the whole world can by no means be denied.

II

The circumstances remain unchanged. The policy of U.S. imperialism has not changed. It is the Soviet leaders who have changed.

The conclusion of a treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests was an object persistently pursued by the United States over a number of years.

In his message to the U.S. Senate dated August 8, U.S. President Kennedy said,

> It grows out of the proposal made by President Eisenhower in 1959 and the resolution passed by the Senate in the same year. . . . Nothing has happened since then to alter its importance to our security.

The Soviet statement says that the conclusion of the tripartite treaty is the first step towards freeing mankind from the threat of nuclear war.

It does not seem so to us. On the contrary, in our view the conclusion of the tripartite treaty increases the danger of nuclear war.

On the question of nuclear weapons, don't you respect only what is said by those who possess nuclear weapons? Let us then hear what those who possess nuclear weapons have said.

In the period between July 26 and August 8, Kennedy repeatedly and outspokenly said that the tripartite treaty

— does not prohibit the United States to conduct underground nuclear tests,

— does not halt the production of nuclear weapons by the United States,

— does not reduce the U.S. nuclear stockpiles,

— does not hinder the United States from spreading nuclear weapons to its allies,

— does not restrict the use of nuclear weapons by the United States in time of war,

— does not prohibit the nuclear arms race,

— does not mean an end to the danger of nuclear war, and

— does not assure world peace.

At the ceremony of the formal signing of this treaty, Rusk said relentlessly, "It is not possible for us to guarantee now what the significance of this act will be."

The treaty was signed primarily between the Soviet Union and the United States. If the pronouncements of Kennedy and Rusk were wrong, why did not the Soviet leaders refute them? To assert that this treaty represents a so-called first step towards preventing nuclear war is a deliberate attempt to fool the people of the world.

What is more, this treaty is highly advantageous to the forces of war headed by U.S. imperialism and highly detrimental to the forces of world peace.

Kennedy said that the first advantage of this treaty to the United States is that it legalizes underground nuclear tests "in which the United States has more experience than any other nation," and the second advantage is that it prohibits nuclear tests in the atmosphere through which "other powers could develop all kinds of weapons more cheaply and quickly than they could underground."

It is by no means a treaty preventing war and strengthening peace, as the Soviet leaders allege; it is a treaty U.S. imperialism can use to pursue its war aims by exploiting the desire of the people of the world for peace. In no sense does the conclusion of this treaty show that U.S. imperialism has become sensible; it is the result of open capitulation by the Soviet leaders to U.S. imperialism.

III

Why did the U.S. imperialists desire such a treaty?

After dropping the first atom bomb on Hiroshima in August 1945, U.S. imperialism tried to exploit its monopoly of nuclear weapons in order to push its policies of aggression and war, to enslave the peoples and lord it over the whole world. But the U.S. policy of nuclear blackmail was unable to prevent the peoples of China, Korea, Viet Nam, Cuba and other countries from winning great victories in their revolutionary

struggles. The Soviet possession of nuclear weapons smashed the nuclear monopoly of the United States and placed the U.S. imperialists in the position of courting self-destruction in case they tried to destroy others. At the same time, all the world's peace-loving countries and people unfolded increasingly powerful struggles against nuclear war and for the banning of nuclear weapons. All this rendered the U.S. imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail more and more ineffective.

In the face of this unfavourable situation, U.S. imperialism, while maintaining the means of "massive retaliation," had to adopt and stress the "strategy of flexible response," which means preparing for both nuclear war and conventional war and both continuing the development of strategic nuclear weapons as means of nuclear blackmail and threats and energetically developing tactical nuclear weapons in preparation for launching "limited nuclear wars" when necessary.

It was in pursuit of this counter-revolutionary strategy that the United States needed a treaty on halting nuclear tests which would

— divorce the cessation of nuclear tests from the general task of banning nuclear weapons and, by such a cessation, provide a screen for U.S. nuclear war preparations,

— exclude a prohibition on underground nuclear tests, so that the United States could improve its strategic nuclear weapons and develop tactical nuclear weapons,

— ensure that the United States and its allies will gain nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union and further develop it, and

— bind all the socialist countries except the Soviet Union and all countries subjected to aggression, without hindering the United States from proliferating its nuclear weapons among its allies and countries under its control.

From beginning to end, the tripartite treaty which has just been concluded satisfies these requirements of the U.S. imperialist global strategy.

IV

By completely divorcing the cessation of nuclear tests from the general task of banning nuclear weapons, the tripartite treaty creates an illusion of peace, lulls the vigilance of the people of the world and provides a screen behind which U.S. imperialism can continue to manufacture, develop and proliferate nuclear weapons; gain nuclear superiority and prepare for a nuclear war.

The authors of the Soviet Government's statement completely forget what the Soviet leaders more than once pointed out, i.e., that a treaty exclusively concerned with the halting of nuclear tests is a deal for deceiving the people. On the contrary, they boast that the tripartite treaty can protect mankind against the dangerous consequences of contamination by radioactive substances. They are cajoling support for the tripartite treaty by exploiting the peoples' natural desire to avoid contamination by radioactive substances.

It should be pointed out firstly that the United States must bear the full responsibility for the pollution of the atmosphere. It was the United States which first tested, manufactured and used atomic weapons and it is the United States which has engaged in the frenzied expansion of nuclear armaments and conducted hundreds of nuclear tests, mostly on the high seas in the Pacific. The great majority of the nuclear tests conducted on this planet have been the work of the United States. According to any principle of equity, the United States should have stopped testing long ago.

In fact, under the pressure of popular demand and world opinion and because it has obtained enough technical data, the United States has already stopped all forms of nuclear tests except underground ones. In the absence of the tripartite treaty, the United States, weighing the advantages and disadvantages, would not dare lightly to resume these forms of nuclear testing. With the tripartite treaty, however, not only is this state of affairs not fixed, but the United

States is given the right to resume these forms of nuclear testing at any time. As soon as the tripartite treaty was initialled, Kennedy declared that the United States remains ready to resume nuclear tests in the atmosphere. He openly said that the tripartite treaty "does not assure the world that it will be for ever free from the fears and dangers of radioactive fallout from atmospheric tests." Unless one's purpose is to deceive the people of the world, how can one describe the treaty as a protection for mankind against contamination by radioactive substances?

Radioactive substances are indeed harmful, but the harm done by a nuclear war will be a hundred times, a thousand times more serious. The Soviet leader Khrushchov once exposed the imperialist scheme as follows:

> There is an apt saying: if the head is gone, it is no use crying over the coiffure. The imperialist gentlemen are preparing death for people in the fire of war and they chatter about people's health.

Now it is enough for us to present the Soviet leaders with the same words. It would be superfluous to add to them on this point.

V

By omitting the prohibition on underground nuclear tests, the tripartite treaty legalizes such tests and makes it easier for the United States to improve its strategic nuclear weapons, develop tactical nuclear weapons, conduct nuclear blackmail and prepare for "limited nuclear wars."

According to data published by the United States, it has carried out more than seventy underground nuclear tests since 1957, and has gained rich experience. It has set up huge, well-equipped underground testing grounds. It is already able to conduct underground medium nuclear tests with the

yield of the equivalent of several hundred thousand tons of TNT. The tripartite treaty gives the United States freedom to conduct about eighty per cent of the nuclear tests it deems necessary. The reservation on underground nuclear testing is most advantageous to the United States.

The U.S. Defence Secretary McNamara said on August 13 that the United States is determined to maintain its nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union. If testing continued indefinitely without limit, the most likely ultimate result would be technical parity between the United States and the U.S.S.R. Since the United States has more experience in underground nuclear tests, to ban other forms of nuclear testing while preserving underground tests will retard Soviet progress and maintain the superiority of the United States. An underground nuclear explosion was demonstratively conducted by the United States only a week after the formal signing of the tripartite treaty.

The United States can continue to improve its strategic nuclear weapons by means of underground tests. These strategic weapons are increasingly becoming a means of political blackmail as they and their means of delivery are being developed more and more and being manufactured and stockpiled in ever greater quantities, and a nuclear stalemate has arisen as a result.

At present, the United States is eagerly seeking to develop tactical nuclear weapons. It intends to use tactical nuclear weapons in local wars in order to deal with non-nuclear socialist and other peace-loving countries and people, and in particular to deal with the Asian, African and Latin American countries and people which are subjected to oppression and aggression.

If this U.S. imperialist scheme should be allowed to succeed, and if U.S. imperialism should be permitted to win in one local war after another and so change the international balance of forces, it would in turn definitely increase the danger of a

total nuclear war. This situation cannot but rouse the people's serious vigilance.

It is an indisputable fact that the tripartite treaty facilitates continued nuclear blackmail and threats by U.S. imperialism and its continued suppression of popular revolutionary movements and national independence movements. In signing this treaty, the Soviet leaders have ignored the vital interests of the oppressed peoples and nations of the world. This is indeed to "play irresponsibly with the destiny of millions upon millions of people."

VI

The tripartite treaty can in no way prevent the United States from carrying out nuclear proliferation, and it tends to strengthen the aggressive forces of the imperialist camp.

Feigning ignorance on this point, the Soviet statement retorts:

> Thus it follows that if nuclear weapons spread throughout the world, if the way was opened for the West German revanchists to gain possession of these weapons, and if one series of nuclear explosions carried out by scores of states would succeed another, this would apparently serve the interests of peace and would not constitute a capitulation to imperialism!

Well, let us see in what way the treaty helps to prevent nuclear proliferation, and what sort of nuclear proliferation it prevents.

Can this treaty prevent U.S. imperialism from proliferating its nuclear weapons, and the technical data for their manufacture, among the West German revanchists and other allies of the United States and countries under its control?

No, absolutely not. The U.S. Government has constantly stressed that it cannot, and the Soviet leaders are aware of this, too. Please look at the facts.

On July 31, Harriman openly stated that there was nothing in the treaty to prevent the United States from disclosing nuclear secrets to its allies. And the United States has already approached France on this matter.

As the whole world knows, the so-called plan for a "multilateral nuclear force" which the United States has been promoting is one of nuclear proliferation among its allies, including the West German revanchists. The conclusion of the tripartite treaty in no way hinders the promotion of this plan. After the initialling of the tripartite treaty, the United States immediately resumed the meeting in Washington to discuss the building of a "multilateral nuclear force."

On the very day that the tripartite treaty was initialled, West German Defence Minister von Hassel serenely remarked that the tripartite treaty did not ban all nuclear tests and that it affected neither the building of a "multilateral armed force" nor the conception of NATO and the West German armed forces as a whole.

On August 12, Rusk went a step further and declared outright that the treaty would not hinder the United States from arming its allies with nuclear weapons and that therefore it would not prevent the construction of the multilateral NATO nuclear force proposed by the United States.

The facts are all here. Who will believe that this paper treaty can possibly prevent the United States from proliferating nuclear weapons and nuclear secrets among its allies and countries under its control, especially West Germany? The Soviet leaders are attempting to justify their act of capitulation by playing on the righteous feelings of the people of Europe against the revival of West German militarism. This attempt has failed in the face of iron-clad facts and will go thoroughly bankrupt in the end.

VII

The object of U.S. imperialism in advocating the prevention of nuclear proliferation is not at all to manacle itself but to manacle socialist countries other than the Soviet Union.

The United States is trying to achieve this object by consolidating the nuclear monopoly position of the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union. The Soviet leaders are fully supporting this plot and playing an active part in carrying it out.

The statement of the Soviet Government says,

> Is it not a fact that what the statement of the PRC Government terms a nuclear monopoly, i.e., the possession by the Soviet Union of these weapons, did play a definite, one might even say the decisive, role in preventing the socialist countries, including the PRC, from becoming objects of imperialist aggression and in enabling them successfully to build socialism and communism?

We cannot agree with this view.

In fighting imperialist aggression and defending its security, every socialist country has to rely in the first place on its own defence capability, and then — and only then — on assistance from fraternal countries and the people of the world. For the Soviet statement to describe all the socialist countries as depending on the nuclear weapons of the Soviet Union for their survival is to strike an out-and-out great-power chauvinistic note and to fly in the face of the facts.

The Chinese Government has always fully appreciated the importance of the Soviet Union's possession of nuclear weapons. However, such possession must in no way be made a justification for preventing other socialist countries from increasing their own defence capabilities. The Moscow Statement of 1960 points out, "So long as there is no disarmament, the socialist countries must maintain their defence potential at an adequate level." If the Soviet Government is earnest about

abiding by the Moscow Statement and really wants to fight the imperialist policies of aggression and war and to defend world peace, there is no reason why it should try so hard to obstruct other socialist countries from increasing their defence capabilities.

With regard to preventing nuclear proliferation, the Chinese Government has always maintained that the arguments of the U.S. imperialists must not be echoed, but that a class analysis must be made. Whether or not nuclear weapons help peace depends on who possesses them. It is detrimental to peace if they are in the hands of imperialist countries; it helps peace if they are in the hands of socialist countries. It must not be said undiscriminatingly that the danger of nuclear war increases along with the increase in the number of nuclear powers. Nuclear weapons were first the monopoly of the United States. Later, the Soviet Union also came to possess them. Did the danger of nuclear war become greater or less when the number of nuclear powers increased from one to two? We say it became less, not greater.

Nuclear weapons in the possession of a socialist country are always a means of defence against nuclear blackmail and nuclear war. So long as the imperialists refuse to ban nuclear weapons, the greater the number of socialist countries possessing them, the better the guarantee of world peace. A fierce class struggle is now going on in the world. In this struggle, the greater the strength on our side, the better. Does it make sense to say the less the better?

However, after attaining possession of nuclear weapons themselves, the Soviet leaders began to echo the arguments of the U.S. imperialists and to endeavour to have the monopoly of nuclear weapons among the socialist countries. This is a total repudiation of the Moscow Statement and a total repudiation of proletarian internationalism.

The Soviet leaders turn a blind eye to U.S. imperialism's proliferation of nuclear weapons to West Germany and do their utmost to prevent other socialist countries from strengthening their defence capabilities. While undermining its allies, U.S. imperialism cannot completely ignore the common interests of the bourgeoisie of different countries; the Soviet leaders, however, are bent on crushing their own class brothers, without showing an iota of proletarian internationalism.

Formerly we thought the Soviet leaders were genuinely afraid of the West German militarists' coming into possession of nuclear weapons. Now we see that they trust U.S. imperialism and think it does not matter if the West German militarists possess nuclear weapons provided they are under the control of the United States. And in order to curry favour with U.S. imperialism, they would not hesitate to obliterate the international position of the German Democratic Republic. They do not really oppose the possession of nuclear weapons by the West German militarists. Nor do they take any interest in strengthening the might of the socialist camp as a whole. The real aim of the Soviet leaders is to compromise with the United States in order to seek momentary ease and to maintain a monopoly of nuclear weapons and lord it over in the socialist camp.

VIII

The Soviet statement says that one must not oppose the tripartite treaty and that whoever opposes it is opposing the relaxation of international tension. What a broad accusation!

True, Soviet-U.S. relations appear to be somewhat relaxed because the Soviet leaders, treating enemies as friends, have struck a political bargain with U.S. imperialism which is entirely to the advantage of the United States.

But at what price is this kind of relaxation achieved? It is achieved at the price of the interests of the Soviet people, of the socialist camp and of the people of the whole world, and at the price of facilitating the nuclear superiority of U.S.

imperialism through its manufacture, development and proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Numerous facts show that, in the struggle against imperialism, relaxation that is won through struggle is a genuine relaxation, while relaxation bought by capitulation is a false relaxation. The so-called relaxation now appearing between the United States and the Soviet Union is only a transient and superficial phenomenon and a false relaxation. It is just what U.S. imperialism can exploit in being more unscrupulous in pushing its global strategy of enslaving the people of the whole world. The danger of war has increased. This line of action of the Soviet leaders is, as the old Chinese saying goes, "indulging in a moment's ease only to incur a century of suffering."

Can such relaxation lead to the solution of major international issues? On the contrary, to seek relaxation through surrender only leads to greater demands and more exacting conditions on the part of the imperialists and feeds their appetite, and thereby making the solution of major international issues increasingly difficult, unless further steps to surrender are taken.

Clearly, such relaxation runs counter to the wishes of the people of the world.

IX

Socialist countries do not want nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons cannot be eaten. No one would be happier than we if nuclear weapons were thoroughly destroyed. The Chinese Government and people have always stood in the forefront of the fight to prohibit them. We maintain that a complete ban on nuclear weapons is an attainable goal and that there are ways of banning them step by step. The three-point proposal of the Chinese Government for the complete prohibition

of nuclear weapons sets the general goal of completely prohibiting and thoroughly destroying nuclear weapons, puts forward four concrete measures for its attainment step by step and makes the reasonable suggestion of a conference of the government heads of all countries in the world. The Chinese proposal is firm, clear-cut and realistic.

Yet the Soviet statement attacks the Chinese attitude as one of "all or nothing" and slanders us as being out of touch with reality.

One might ask, is it unrealistic for the people of the whole world to demand the dismantling of military bases, including nuclear bases, on foreign soil?

Is it unrealistic for many countries to demand the establishment of nuclear weapon-free zones?

Is it unrealistic to demand the prohibition of the export and import of nuclear weapons and technical data for their manufacture and a genuine prohibition of nuclear proliferation?

Is it unrealistic to demand the cessation of all nuclear tests, including underground ones?

In fact, it is the concrete measures we propose that constitute the first step towards the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. Take the proposal concerning the nuclear weapon-free zones, for instance. If only the nuclear powers undertake their due obligations, a nuclear weapon-free zone in Latin America and a nuclear weapon-free zone in Africa could be established at once. The peoples in these two areas all eagerly desire to place themselves beyond nuclear threats, so that they may successfully develop their countries. They will not menace the nuclear powers. Why cannot the nuclear powers undertake such obligations and respect these peoples' desire for the establishment of nuclear weapon-free zones?

By using the word "unrealistic," the authors of the Soviet statement try to dismiss the earnest desire of millions upon millions of people throughout the world. Clearly, in their eyes, the countries and people that do not have nuclear weap-

ons are not worth a single glance, and the struggle waged in the interests of the people of the world is unrealistic. All they see is nuclear weapons, and in their opinion the only thing that is realistic is to divide spheres of influence with the imperialists who possess nuclear weapons.

The authors of the Soviet statement assert that there is nothing new in the Chinese proposal. It is true that what we propose now we have consistently advocated in the past. In this sense, there is indeed nothing new in our proposal. They also say that they have previously advocated everything in our present proposal. That, too, is basically true. But there is one difference. They no longer advocate it now. Occasionally, they still refer to it, but that is merely for show and for deceiving the people. Our present proposal has become a new one precisely because they have betrayed the correct position they once persistently held to.

The Soviet leaders have let fall the banner of the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons, and it is our duty to raise it still higher.

The authors of the Soviet statement assert that by not joining in their fraud, we are siding with the imperialist "madmen" and opposing the people of the world, while conversely, by collaborating with the imperialists to fool the people of the world, they have become fighters shaking the imperialist forces of aggression and become the representatives of the people of the world.

Let us then ask, who represents the imperialist forces of aggression? As the Moscow Statement points out, U.S. imperialism is the biggest international exploiter, the chief bulwark of world reaction, the mainstay of colonialism today, the international gendarme, the main force of aggression and war and the enemy of the people of the whole world.

As everybody knows, this imperialism is represented by Kennedy, Rusk, Harriman and the like. It may be asked: Is it you or is it we who call these imperialist big guns "peace fighters" and brothers and warmly embrace them?

X

The conclusion of the tripartite treaty once again shows that the Soviet leaders seek only to preserve themselves and would leave other people to sink or swim. They have repeatedly said that so long as they themselves survive and develop the people of the world will be saved. The fact is they are selling out the fundamental interests of the people of the world in order to seek their own momentary ease. All countries and peoples subjected to oppression and aggression are now engaged in earth-shaking struggles against imperialism and old and new colonialism headed by the United States and for their own independence and freedom. Yet the Soviet leaders, of one mind with U.S. imperialism, have collaborated with it in a fraud and want the people of the world to believe that the U.S. imperialists are "peace fighters," thus lulling their fighting will and undermining the cause of world peace. But the people of all countries will not likewise regard enemies as friends. Their own bitter experience will enable them to realize gradually that they can save themselves and ensure world peace only by carrying through to the end the struggle against imperialism and old and new colonialism headed by the United States.

It should be understood that the relationship between the Soviet people and the other peoples of the world is one of mutual reliance, like that between lips and teeth. The existence and development of the Soviet Union are a support to the revolutionary struggles of other peoples, while in turn these peoples' revolutionary struggles and victories support the Soviet Union. There is no reason whatsoever to think that the Soviet Union no longer needs others' support. In fact this is not the case. If the lips are gone, the teeth are exposed. If U.S. imperialism should be given a free hand to put down the revolutionary struggles of other peoples and if the Soviet leaders should ally themselves with U.S. imperial-

ism against the fraternal countries, eventually it will not be possible for the Soviet Union itself to be preserved.

The present trend of events merits the vigilance of all peoples. Having long hoped for a ban on nuclear weapons, people understandably rejoice at hearing of a partial halting of nuclear tests. They hope it will lead to a complete cessation of nuclear tests and a complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. But the paper treaty concoeted by the three nuclear powers is not to be depended on. In order to realize the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons step by step it is necessary to carry on an unswerving struggle. As a minimum, it is necessary, in the light of the proposal of the Chinese Government, first of all to compel the nuclear powers to undertake not to use, or test, or proliferate nuclear weapons and undertake to respect the nuclear weapon-free zones. Only when these undertakings are secured can we regard the situation as having advanced a step towards peace. We are convinced that, after all, a fraud is a fraud and will not be able to stand the test of time. In the end, the attempt to use the desire of the people of the world for peace to carry out speculation will fail.

XI

It is not only at present that the Soviet leaders have begun to collude with U.S. imperialism and attempt to manacle China.

As far back as June 20, 1959, when there was not yet the slightest sign of a treaty on stopping nuclear tests, the Soviet Government unilaterally tore up the agreement on new technology for national defence concluded between China and the Soviet Union on October 15, 1957, and refused to provide China with a sample of an atomic bomb and technical data concerning its manufacture. This was done as a presentation

gift at the time the Soviet leader went to the United States for talks with Eisenhower in September.

On August 25, 1962, two days before the United States and Britain put forward their draft treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests, the Soviet Government notified China that U.S. Secretary of State Rusk had proposed an agreement stipulating that, firstly, the nuclear powers should undertake to refrain from transferring nuclear weapons and technical information concerning their manufacture to non-nuclear countries, and that, secondly, the countries not in possession of nuclear weapons should undertake to refrain from manufacturing them, from seeking them from the nuclear powers or from accepting technical information concerning their manufacture. The Soviet Government gave an affirmative reply to this proposal of Rusk's.

The Chinese Government sent three memoranda to the Soviet Government, on September 3, 1962, October 20, 1962, and June 6, 1963, stating that it was a matter for the Soviet Government whether it committed itself to the United States to refrain from transferring nuclear weapons and technical information concerning their manufacture to China; but that the Chinese Government hoped the Soviet Government would not infringe on China's sovereign rights and act for China in assuming an obligation to refrain from manufacturing nuclear weapons. We solemnly stated that we would not tolerate the conclusion, in disregard of China's opposition, of any sort of treaty between the Soviet Government and the United States which aimed at depriving the Chinese people of their right to take steps to resist the nuclear threats of U.S. imperialism, and that we would issue statements to make our position known.

We hope that after such earnest counsel from us, the Soviet leaders would rein in before reaching the precipice and would not render matters irretrievable. Unfortunately, they did not pay the slightest attention to our counsel. They finally concluded the treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests with

the United States and Britain, thereby attempting to bring pressure to bear on China and force her into commitments.

The whole course of events amounts to this: First the Soviet Government tried to subdue China and curry favour with U.S. imperialism by discontinuing assistance to China. Then it put forward all sorts of untenable arguments in an attempt to induce China to abandon its solemn stand. Failing in all this, it has brazenly ganged up with the imperialist bandits in exerting pressure on China.

In view of all the above, China has long ceased to place any hope in the Soviet leaders in developing its own nuclear strength to resist the U.S. nuclear threats.

XII

The authors of the Soviet statement claim that since the Soviet Government put forward a proposal for the complete banning of nuclear weapons as far back as 1946 and has all along worked for a ban on nuclear weapons, it cannot possibly err on issues related to nuclear weapons. On the contrary, in our view, their error is all the more serious because they have now betrayed their past correct position.

From 1946 to 1956, the Soviet Government insisted on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. They were correct then and we firmly supported them. In his summary report to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956, the Soviet leader divorced the cessation of nuclear tests from the question of disarmament. Subsequently, they were wrong on certain issues and correct on others, and we supported them in all their correct views. But on July 25, 1963, they went altogether wrong, and it is quite natural that we should resolutely criticize them.

The authors of the Soviet statement charge China with disrespect for the sovereignty of the Soviet state and slander the authors of the Chinese statement as having gone out

of their minds and as attempting to set the Soviet people against the Soviet Government. It pretentiously asks: Is not the Chinese Government "taking too much upon itself"? We can tell them frankly that we are not taking too much upon ourselves at all. We are Communists. According to the correct criteria they once put forward themselves, and according to Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement, it is our proletarian internationalist duty to point out that they have now betrayed the interests of the Soviet people and the entire socialist camp. If indeed anyone has gone out of his mind, it is definitely not the Chinese people, who have consistently maintained a correct stand; it is the Soviet leaders, who have betrayed their own position midway.

If the Soviet leaders consider that betrayal of the interests of the Soviet people is within the sovereign rights of the Soviet state, then of course they are entitled to say so. But if you try to gag us on the pretext of non-interference in internal affairs, you will not succeed. To defend Marxism-Leninism, one must expose acts of betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and of proletarian internationalism. Anyone who does not expose such acts of betrayal ceases to be a Communist.

By concluding the tripartite treaty the Soviet leaders are trying to show the correctness of the so-called general line of peaceful coexistence which they have been following since the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. To glory in one's shame — this can only make people split their sides. What does the conclusion of the tripartite treaty show? It merely shows that the line followed by the Soviet leaders in foreign affairs is one of out-and-out capitulation. The imperialists are of course willing to coexist with those who surrender to them. However, this is not peaceful coexistence but capitulationist coexistence.

The Soviet leaders have already gone far along the wrong road. We hope they will reconsider their position and return to the road of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian interna-

tionalism, to the road of unity with the countries in the socialist camp and the people of the world.

The Soviet Government has published the July 31 statement of the Chinese Government in its press; that is not a bad thing and is in conformity with the principle of reciprocity. We hope the Soviet leaders will carry on this good practice and publish our present statement.

STATEMENT BY THE SPOKESMAN OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT

—A COMMENT ON THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT'S STATEMENT OF AUGUST 21

September 1, 1963

On August 21 the Soviet Government issued a statement in reply to the statement by the spokesman of the Chinese Government on August 15.

This Soviet statement is even less passable than its forerunners. It is unable to advance a single logical argument in defence of the Soviet leaders' act of betrayal; it cannot answer any of the questions of substance we raised in our last statement. The only new element in it is its assertion that China wants to gain victory through the launching of thermonuclear war and to bring about the death of half of mankind. With this assertion, the latest slander campaign of the Soviet leaders against China plumbs new depths. Apparently the Soviet leaders have become so degenerate that they now depend on telling lies for a living.

More and more facts bear witness that on the question of war and peace the Soviet leaders' theory is one of forbidding revolution and their practice is one of moving from adventurism to capitulationism; the conclusion of the tripartite treaty marks the further development of their capitulationism. To cover all this up they are desperately distorting the Marxist-Leninist line of the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese Government on the question of war and peace, asserting that China wants to impose its "adventurist programme" on other countries.

The Soviet Government in its statement is insolent enough to say that we are able to criticize them only because China enjoys the protection of Soviet nuclear weapons.

Well, then, leaders of the Soviet Union, please continue to protect us a while with your nuclear weapons. We shall continue to criticize you, and we hope you will have the courage to argue the matter out with us.

I

In our statements of July 31 and August 15, we demonstrated irrefutably that in signing the tripartite treaty the Soviet leaders betrayed their original stand, sold out the interests of the Soviet people and sold out the interests of the peoples in the socialist camp and of the people throughout the world.

In its statement of August 3, the Soviet Government erected the shield of state sovereignty against this criticism of ours. Now they are erecting a shield out of national defence secrets. They say that it was circumstances and not the Soviet leaders that had changed. And what were the changed circumstances? Ah! That cannot be divulged because it is a national defence secret.

This is sheer hypocrisy. National defence secret indeed! The simple fact is that after its tests in 1961 and 1962, the Soviet Union came into possession of the technical data it needed. Who does not know this so-called national defence secret! That took place back in 1962, but as late as June 15, 1963 the Soviet leaders were still saying that the position of the West was unacceptable. How can the 180-degree turn made by the Soviet leaders after June 15, 1963 in betrayal of their original position be explained away by the change which had taken place in 1962?

With the conclusion of the tripartite treaty, the Soviet statement asserts: At the worst the situation is the same as without

the treaty; how can anyone say the treaty has increased the danger of war? The United States may conduct underground nuclear tests, but cannot the Soviet Union do likewise?

This assertion can only delude people who do not look beyond the surface or are most naive. The essence of the matter is that the United States is in the lead in the field of underground nuclear testing. Without the tripartite treaty, the United States would have been condemned when it engaged in underground nuclear testing. The tripartite treaty legalizes underground nuclear testing, which precisely helps the United States maintain and improve on its lead.

Already in the short period since the conclusion of the tripartite treaty the United States has conducted three underground nuclear tests. On August 24 the U.S. Defence Department submitted a programme to the Senate, proposing a great increase in underground nuclear tests. U.S. Deputy Defense Secretary Gilpatric said:

> "The underground testing programme of the United States will be comprehensive. Therefore, it will be revised to include as many as feasible of the objectives of the tests which we would otherwise do under conditions of unrestricted testing," so as "to ensure the highest practicable rate of progress in nuclear technology."

All this is shocking to people who are truly concerned about peace. How can the Soviet leaders feign blindness?

The whole world knows that the tripartite treaty is designed to manacle socialist countries other than the Soviet Union and all the peace-loving countries, and that it has no restraining effect whatsoever on U.S. imperialism. It does not hinder the United States from using nuclear weapons in time of war, manufacturing and stockpiling nuclear weapons and proliferating nuclear weapons among its allies. Since the conclusion of the tripartite treaty, U.S. imperialism has continuously declared that it is not bound in any way, and the Soviet leaders have not uttered a sound of protest.

The Soviet statement feigns ignorance of all this and maintains that the Soviet leaders' position on the question of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons is perfectly reasonable.

The Soviet statement says it would not mean much if one or two more socialist countries came into possession of nuclear weapons, but it would be terrible if one or two more capitalist countries did so; that the Soviet Union cannot on the one hand give nuclear weapons to China and on the other oppose the United States giving nuclear weapons to West Germany; and that if the Soviet Union did so, the United States would surely arm West Germany with nuclear weapons. The Soviet statement boastfully proclaims this to be the Soviet leaders' "principled stand" on the question of preventing nuclear proliferation.

My! A "principled stand"! But let us see what this "principled stand" amounts to.

Anyone having some knowledge of Marxism-Leninism and using his head just a little will see:

— that it is a cowardly stand which holds the strength of one's own class brothers in utter contempt and that of the imperialists in awe and veneration;

— that it is an absurd stand which puts the socialist camp and the imperialist camp on a par and makes no distinction between the enemy and ourselves, and

— that it is a reactionary stand which implies that U.S. imperialist nuclear proliferation is not for aggression but for defence and that the aggressive nature of imperialism has already changed.

Even a bourgeois statesman with some common sense can understand that a commitment undertaken must be premised on a commitment accepted by the other party. The Soviet Union is not giving nuclear weapons to China, but has the United States undertaken an obligation not to arm West Germany with nuclear weapons?

In our view, the dogged adherence by the Soviet leaders to their "principled stand" is a matter of unrequited love. How pitiless are the U.S. imperialists! After signing the tripartite treaty, they noisily proceed with building up the NATO "multilateral nuclear force" and continue to ship nuclear weapons to West Germany. Where is there any sign of a commitment?

The tripartite treaty marks the surrender of the Soviet leaders to U.S. imperialism. It is rotten to the core. China of course cannot be a party to it.

The Soviet statement asserts that in refusing to sign this treaty, China is assuming the role of those in the Right-wing of the ranks of the U.S. "madmen", the West German revanchists and the French extremists. If that is the case, do not Chiang Kai-shek, Adenauer and Franco, who have signed, become Left-wing forces of peace? So that is how matters stand! This is indeed a great discovery by the Soviet leaders!

II

Unable to find any reasonable arguments to defend the tripartite treaty, the Soviet leaders resort to slandering China. One slander is that China is opposed to the tripartite treaty because the Soviet Union has denied it the atom bomb. This is a deliberate distortion of China's position.

In our last statement we explained in detail how, as far back as 1959, the Soviet leaders made a gift to the United States of their refusal to provide China with the technical data required for the manufacture of nuclear weapons. But for the sake of larger interests, we never mentioned this before, not even between fraternal Parties. If it were not because the Soviet leaders have colluded with the U.S. imperialists in an effort to force China to undertake not to manufacture nuclear weapons, we would not have wanted to discuss this.

Our exposure has enraged the Soviet leaders, who declare that it amounts to divulgence of confidential documents and information relating to the defences of the countries in the socialist camp, and that they will draw their own conclusions.

Please do not pretend. You know very well that long before we published our last statement you had informed the Americans of the secrets between China and the Soviet Union concerning nuclear weapons.

As for drawing conclusions, have you not already done that long ago? Not only have you perfidiously and unilaterally scrapped the agreement on providing China with nuclear technical data, but you have blatantly given more and more military aid to the Indian reactionaries, who are hostile to China and have made incessant armed provocations against it. What is this if it is not drawing your "own conclusions"?

The real point is that the Soviet leaders hold that China should not, and must not, manufacture nuclear weapons, and that only the few existing nuclear powers, and particularly U.S. imperialism, the enemy of the people of the whole world, are entitled to the continued production of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet statement asserts that China can rely on the nuclear weapons of the Soviet Union and has no need to manufacture them itself, and that if it tries to manufacture them it will result in a great strain on China's economy.

Should or should not China itself master the means of resisting U.S. nuclear blackmail?

True, if the Soviet leaders really practised proletarian internationalism, China might consider it unnecessary for it to manufacture its own nuclear weapons.

But it is equally true that if the Soviet leaders really practised proletarian internationalism, they would have no reason whatever for obstructing China from manufacturing nuclear weapons.

Is not China very poor and backward? Yes, it is. The Soviet leaders say, how can the Chinese be qualified to manufacture nuclear weapons when they eat watery soup out of a common bowl and do not even have pants to wear?

The Soviet leaders are perhaps too hasty in deriding China for its backwardness. They may or may not have judged right. But in any case, even if we Chinese people are unable to produce an atom bomb for a hundred years, we will neither crawl to the baton of the Soviet leaders nor kneel before the nuclear blackmail of the U.S. imperialists.

The Soviet statement says that if China were to produce two or three atom bombs, the imperialists would aim many more atom bombs at China. This is in effect instigating the imperialists to threaten China with atom bombs.

Of course the fact that the U.S. imperialists may wish to aim more atom and hydrogen bombs at China merits attention and vigilance. But there is nothing terrifying about it. At this very moment the United States has many such bombs already poised against China. It will not make much difference if the United States listens to the Soviet leaders and adds a few more. The Chinese people will not tremble before U.S. nuclear threats. But one must ask: Where do the Soviet leaders place themselves in making such an instigation?

In the eyes of the Soviet leaders, the whole world and the destiny of all mankind revolve round nuclear weapons. Therefore they hold on tightly to their nuclear weapons, afraid that someone might take them away or come to possess them, and so break up their monopoly. They are very nervous. They attribute China's principled criticism of the tripartite treaty to its failure to obtain the atom bombs it desires.

We feel that this attitude of the Soviet leaders is ludicrous. It calls to mind the following ancient Chinese fable:

> Hui Tzu was Prime Minister of the State of Liang. Chuang Tzu was on his way to call on him.
>
> Somebody said to Hui Tzu, "Chuang Tzu is coming with the intention of taking over your place as Prime Minister."

Hui Tzu became afraid and hunted for Chuang Tzu high and low for three days and three nights.

Chuang Tzu appeared before Hui Tzu and said, "Have you heard about the southern bird, the phoenix? It set out from the South Sea to fly to the North Sea. It would not alight except on the Wutung tree. It would eat nothing except the fruit of the bamboo. It would drink nothing except the purest spring water. An owl, which had got hold of a dead rat, looked up as the phoenix flew over and screeched to warn it off. Are you, too, not screeching at me, over your kingdom of Liang?"

The moral of this fable is that different people have different aspirations, and it is improper to measure the stature of great men by the yardstick of small men.

III

The main feature of the Soviet Government's latest statement is its slander that we want socialism to win by means of thermonuclear war and that we would sacrifice 300 million Chinese and a half of mankind in order to create a greater civilization on the corpses and the ruins. Railing at China, the Soviet statement asserts that China is carrying out "an inhuman policy" and following a "bestial conception."

This is really hair-raising stuff. How shocking! The Chinese Communists are nothing but a bunch of blood-thirsty monsters, worse than Hitler, worse than any tyrants past or present, and, needless to say, hundreds of times worse than the U.S. imperialists.

But how is this possible? On what do the Soviet leaders base themselves in making such fantastic charges against China? Their charges, however varied, boil down to two counts:

First, that some responsible Chinese leaders have talked about the possibility that in a war people may die by hundreds of millions;

Second, that the Chinese journal *Hongqi (Red Flag)* has made the assertion that the victorious people would create a beautiful future for themselves on the ruins of imperialism.

The references are to certain remarks made by Comrade Mao Tse-tung in his speech at the Moscow meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties on November 18, 1957 and to a passage in the article "Long Live Leninism!" written by the editorial department of *Hongqi*.

Let us see what the Chinese Communist Party actually said. Comrade Mao Tse-tung said:

> It is my opinion that the international situation has now reached a new turning point. There are two winds in the world today, the East wind and the West wind. There is a Chinese saying, "Either the East wind prevails over the West wind or the West wind prevails over the East wind." **It is characteristic of the situation today,** I believe, **that the East wind is prevailing over the West wind. That is to say, the forces of socialism are overwhelmingly superior to the forces of imperialism.**

Proceeding from that appraisal, Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed to the steadily growing possibility of preventing imperialism from launching a new world war.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung then added,

> At present another situation has to be taken into account, **namely, that the war maniacs may drop atomic and hydrogen bombs everywhere.** They drop them and we act after their fashion; thus there will be chaos and lives will be lost. The question has to be considered for the worst. The Political Bureau of our Party has held several sessions to discuss this question. If fighting breaks out now, China has got only hand-grenades and not atomic bombs — which the Soviet Union has though. Let us imagine, how many peo-

ple will die if war should break out? Out of the world's population of 2,700 million, one third — or, if more, half — may be lost. **It is they and not we who want to fight;** when a fight starts, atomic and hydrogen bombs may be dropped. I debated this question with a foreign statesman. He believed that if an atomic war was fought, the whole of mankind would be annihilated. I said that if the worst came to the worst and half of mankind died, the other half would remain while imperialism would be razed to the ground and the whole world would become socialist; in a number of years there would be 2,700 million people again and definitely more. **We Chinese have not yet completed our construction and we desire peace.** However, **if imperialism insists on fighting a war, we will have no alternative but to make up our minds and fight to the finish before going ahead with our construction.** If every day you are afraid of war and war eventually comes, what will you do then? First I have said that the East wind prevails over the West wind and that war will not break out, and now I have added these explanations about the situation in case war should break out. In this way both possibilities have been taken into account.

The passage in "Long Live Leninism!" reads:

We consistently oppose the launching of criminal wars by imperialism, because imperialist war would impose enormous sacrifices upon the people of various countries (including the people of the United States and other imperialist countries). But **should the imperialists impose such sacrifices on them,** we believe that, just as the experience of the Russian revolution and the Chinese revolution shows, those sacrifices would not be in vain. The victorious people would very swiftly create on the ruins of imperialism a civilization thousands of times higher than the capitalist system and a truly beautiful future for themselves.

The meaning of these words is very clear:

1. China wants peace, and not war;
2. It is the imperialists, and not we, who want to fight;
3. A world war can be prevented;
4. Even in the eventuality that imperialism should impose a war on the people of the world and inflict tragic losses on them, it is the imperialist system, and not mankind, that would perish, and the future of mankind would still be bright.

In effect, we have only made these four points. They are interrelated. But the Soviet leaders have seized hold of half the sentence in which we mention the possibility that the people of the world might suffer tragic sacrifice, quoted it out of context and turned the remaining points inside out. Hence the conclusion: China wants war, and not peace; China, and not imperialism, wants to fight; a world war is inevitable; and China wants to launch a nuclear world war and bring about the death of half of mankind so as to attain a bright future for mankind. It is indeed pitiable that the leaders of a great power, and a great socialist power at that, should resort to such low fabrications.

But the Soviet leaders' lies are really too gross and fantastic. Anyone who uses his brains will ask, how can China launch a nuclear war if it does not possess a single atom bomb? All revolutionaries throughout the world know that imperialism is the source of war. How can anyone imagine that socialist China will launch a world war? It is inconceivable.

The quoted remarks of Comrade Mao Tse-tung in 1957 were a reply to some people's view that mankind will be annihilated if imperialism unleashes a nuclear war. The Soviet leaders have been spreading this view over a number of years and are still spreading it. They say that if imperialism unleashes a nuclear war, it will not only scorch everything but will burn everything to ashes, i.e., the 3,000 million people of the world will all die. We do not agree with this pessimistic and despairing view of theirs. We say that if imperialism should unleash a nuclear war and the worst came to the worst, half of the world's population might be killed. We are optimistic about the future of mankind.

They say, our extreme supposition that half the world's population might die is a bestial conception. Does that not make their oft-repeated view, that all the 3,000 million people of the world would die, doubly bestial?

While propagating the theory of the annihilation of mankind, they say that the people of the world will bury imperialism if imperialism forces a nuclear war on them. For instance, the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU of July 14 declared, "It stands to reason, of course, that if the imperialist madmen unleash a war, the peoples will sweep away capitalism and bury it." But people are bound to ask, if according to your theory all the 3,000 million people in the world will die if imperialism unleashes a nuclear war, then who would remain to bury imperialism?

As a matter of fact, this lie of the Soviet leaders is not a new one, nor can they claim its authorship.

On October 1 and again on October 8, 1960, Wadsworth, the U.S. delegate to the U.N. General Assembly, quoted out of context the sentences in "Long Live Leninism!" concerning the ruins of imperialism. He slanderously asserted that China "welcomes an atomic war," and wants a world war "fought with hydrogen bombs," "if only that war promises the conquest of the world by communism."

In his book *Socialism and War* published in 1960, Kardelj of the renegade Tito clique also slandered China as wanting to unleash a world war to promote world revolution. On September 2, 1960, the Soviet paper *Pravda* said in criticizing this book that Kardelj was helping the U.S. imperialist big guns and that he, "in substance, repeats the slanders spread by the U.S. imperialists about the 'aggressiveness' of People's China."

Now the Soviet leaders have simply collected the spittle of the imperialists and the renegades. The U.S. imperialists had a shot at this slander but then dropped it when they saw that no one paid it any attention. But the Soviet leaders endlessly repeat the same lie, toning it up with colour and life, and insisting on making people believe it.

Why do the Soviet leaders go on repeating this big lie? Do they really believe that the imperialists would not launch another world war? Do they really believe that China wants to launch a world war? Clearly, this is not the crux of the matter.

The crucial point is what should be the policy in face of U.S. imperialist nuclear blackmail and threats — resistance or capitulation? We stand for resistance, and so they say we want to launch a war and bring about the death of half of mankind. They even hold that whoever dares to assume imperialism may launch a war wants to launch a war himself. In that case, what is the way out? Of course, the only way is capitulation and capitulation before the imperialists act. In the final analysis, they are racking their brains and telling all these lies for the purpose of covering up their disreputable capitulationist stand.

IV

The Soviet statement declares that "the appeals of the PRC leaders smack strongly of demagogy and adventurism," and that "to link the fate of the national liberation movement with an aggravation of international tension, with urging humanity to a world thermonuclear war, as the PRC leaders are doing, is like promising the peoples freedom after death."

The Soviet leaders' meaning is clear. Possessing nuclear weapons, imperialism must not be resisted. Should the oppressed peoples and nations resist and should the socialist countries support their resistance, that would be pushing mankind into a world thermonuclear war.

The Soviet leaders hold that "no problem of the revolutionary movement of the working class or the national liberation movement can now be considered in isolation from the struggle to preserve peace and avert a world thermonuclear war."

The Soviet leaders hold that "'local wars' in our time are very dangerous, for any small 'local war' might spark off the conflagration of a world war."

The Soviet leaders hold that if the people of any country dare to wage a revolutionary war against imperialism, all they are doing is hankering after "dying beautifully" and engaging in a "movement for piling up corpses."

The Soviet leaders hold that if a nuclear war should break out, "in the case of many peoples the question of socialism would be eliminated altogether, because they would have disappeared bodily from our planet."

The Soviet leaders even hold that, under the threat of a nuclear war, Kennedy, the chieftain of U.S. imperialism, and people like him have "shown concern for the preservation of peace" and "try on their part to avert a war."

In short, in the opinion of the Soviet leaders, the emergence of nuclear weapons has changed everything, changed both the nature of imperialism and the nature of our epoch. Our epoch is no longer one of revolution as defined in the Moscow Statement, but a nuclear epoch, a nuclear century.

In the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU dated July 14, the Soviet leaders said, "The nuclear rocket weapons that were created in the middle of our century changed old notions about wars." In reality, this means that, with the emergence of nuclear weapons, war is no longer the continuation of politics, there is no longer any difference between unjust and just wars, imperialism is no longer the source of war, and the people of various countries should no longer wage just wars against imperialist armed aggression and armed suppression by a reactionary regime, for such just wars cannot possibly be won but will only bring about the annihilation of mankind.

The conclusion must be: The only thing to do for all the oppressed peoples and nations and for all countries and people subjected to aggression and oppression, if they do not want to court self-destruction, is to capitulate to imperialism which

possesses nuclear weapons. Anyone who dares to resist imperialist oppression, aggression and threats and to wage a revolutionary war for independence and liberation, or anyone who dares to support such a revolutionary war, is guilty of the error of adventurism and will be held responsible for the disaster of the "annihilation of mankind." In the opinion of the Soviet leaders, to remain alive is everything in this nuclear century, and there is no other aim in life. This is the philosophy of docile slaves which demands of the people of the world that they should submit to the tender mercies of imperialism. It is a reactionary theory in the service of imperialism. It is a truly bestial conception.

V

The views of the Soviet leaders referred to above are a total betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and are completely contradicted by the facts of history since the end of World War II.

It is clear except to the blind that since the emergence of nuclear weapons, the imperialists have continued to resort to counter-revolutionary wars as a way of carrying out their policies of oppressing and enslaving the peoples of various countries and that the countries and peoples suffering from aggression and oppression have continued to regard revolutionary wars as the way to oppose imperialist aggression and oppression and to win their independence and liberation. The history of the last eighteen years is replete with wars of aggression and wars against aggression, with unjust and just wars. War is still the continuation of polities.

At the end of World War II, after it had dropped two atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Japan, U.S. imperialism assumed that armed with this "ultimate weapon" it could ride roughshod over the world and do whatever it pleased. At the time there was a kind of fear-mentality among the Chinese people as well as among the peoples of other countries. U.S.

imperialism, possessed of atomic weapons, appeared to them so powerful that they thought it could put down peoples' revolutions at will.

Precisely at that crucial moment Comrade Mao Tse-tung said in his talk with the American correspondent Anna Louise Strong in 1946:

> The atom bomb is a paper tiger which the U.S. reactionaries use to scare people. It looks terrible, but in fact it isn't. Of course, the atom bomb is a weapon of mass slaughter, but the outcome of a war is decided by the people, not by one or two new types of weapon.
>
> All reactionaries are paper tigers. In appearance, the reactionaries are terrifying, but in reality they are not so powerful. From a long-term point of view, it is not the reactionaries but the people who are really powerful.

This Marxist-Leninist thesis of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's was a timely exposure of the U.S. imperialists' plot of atomic blackmail and armed the Chinese people and the revolutionary people of all countries against it. The victory after victory which the people of many countries have won in their revolutionary wars against the aggression and enslavement by the imperialists and their lackeys in the past seventeen years have repeatedly proved the correctness of this thesis.

Even while the U.S. imperialists still had a monopoly of nuclear weapons, the Chinese people achieved the great victory of their revolution in defiance of U.S. imperialist blackmail and intimidation.

Even while the U.S. imperialists still retained their nuclear superiority, they were unable to prevent the defeat of their war of aggression in Korea. In November 1950, after the U.S. imperialists had met with serious reverses on the Korean battlefield, Truman, then President of the United States, cried for the use of atomic bombs, and this immediately aroused indignant protests from the people of the whole world as well as general panic and opposition from the allies of the United

States. Furthermore, U.S. military personnel did not believe that the use of atomic weapons on the Korean battlefield would actually be effective. As a result, throughout the Korean war the U.S. imperialists never dared to use atomic weapons.

Following the armistice in Korea, the people of Viet Nam were victorious in their revolutionary war against French imperialism. Even though it held atomic weapons, U.S. imperialism was unable to realize its plan for increasing its intervention in the war in Viet Nam.

After more than seven years of hard and bitter struggle, the people of Algeria were victorious in their war for national independence.

At the very gate of U.S. imperialism, the people of Cuba won victory in their revolution through armed struggle. U.S. imperialism has never dared to declare that it would use nuclear weapons against the Cuban people.

The people's armed forces in southern Viet Nam are now carrying on a victorious struggle against the U.S. imperialists and their lackey, the Ngo Dinh Diem clique. Although the U.S. imperialists have employed a great variety of new weapons, they have not dared to use nuclear ones.

U.S. imperialism cannot stop the people's revolutionary struggles in various countries by means of nuclear weapons. The reason is that, politically, recourse to this kind of weapon would place U.S. imperialism in an extremely isolated position and, militarily, the massive destructiveness of such weapons limits their use; for in civil wars and wars of national independence, where the lines are zigzag and the fighting is at close range, the use of nuclear weapons of mass destruction would inflict damage on both belligerents.

In a speech delivered on December 16, 1959, Kennedy admitted that U.S. nuclear strength "cannot be used in so-called 'brush-fire' peripheral war. It was not used in Korea, Indo-China, Hungary, Suez, Lebanon, Quemoy, Tibet or Laos. In short, it cannot prevent the Communists from gradually nibbling away at the fringe of the free world's territory and

strength, until our security is being steadily eroded in piecemeal fashion. . . ."

It is therefore evident that, provided the revolutionary people are not afraid of the imperialists' nuclear blackmail and persevere in their just struggles, they can gain victories in their revolutions. Such struggles and victories have not led to world war, but have constantly weakened and effectively restrained imperialism, and thus have reduced the danger of the imperialists' launching a world war and safeguarded world peace.

The interests of the people's revolutions and of world peace are identical. It is a manifestation of the proletarian internationalism of the Chinese Communist Party when it gives full support to the constantly growing national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Soviet leaders slander this Chinese Communist Party stand as being racist and accuse us of undermining the unity of the national liberation movement with the international proletariat. As a matter of fact, since you smear the national liberation movement as a "movement for piling up corpses" and as "promising the peoples freedom after death," what is the need for your talking about this unity? Is there any meaning in uniting with a pile of corpses? Your contempt for the coloured peoples and the oppressed nations is a downright racist and reactionary nationalist attitude.

VI

Imperialism, whose doom is sealed, cannot save itself by relying on nuclear weapons, nor can the socialist countries win victory in their struggle against imperialism by relying solely on such weapons.

We have always fully appreciated the important role played by the Soviet Union's possession of nuclear weapons in the struggle of the people of the world against the imperialist

policies of aggression and war and for world peace. But there is a limit to everything, and once the limit is exceeded, the thing is reduced to absurdity. It is a pity that in their attitude towards the Soviet Union's possession of nuclear weapons the Soviet leaders have exceeded the limit.

They keep on exaggerating the role of nuclear weapons and blindly trust in them, despise the masses and have forgotten that the masses are the makers of history, and so they have degenerated into worshippers of nuclear weapons.

In June 1960, during the Bucharest meeting, the Soviet leader Khrushchov remarked that in the past they too had once organized militia but that now they had modern weapons, for them, militia were not troops but just human flesh.

It is crystal clear that in the eyes of the Soviet leaders the 3,000 million people of the world are nothing but rubbish, while the nuclear arms of the Soviet Union and the U.S. imperialists are infinitely powerful magic weapons.

That is why they boast so much about what they call the decisive role of Soviet nuclear weapons in the defence of world peace and completely deny the great significance of the peoples' anti-imperialist struggles throughout the world.

On July 10, 1962, the Soviet leader said at the World Conference for General Disarmament and Peace in Moscow that "the rocket-nuclear might of the Soviet Union serves as a decisive means of defending peace and has already more than once saved mankind from a world war which the Western imperialist cliques attempted to unleash."

The latest statement of the Soviet Government is even more brazen in asserting that Soviet nuclear weapons played the decisive role in defeating the Anglo-French war of aggression against Egypt in 1956 and frustrating the plot of the U.S. armed threat against Syria in 1957 and the U.S.-British plot to send troops for intervention in Iraq in 1958.

All these defeats suffered by the imperialists resulted primarily from the struggles of the Egyptian, Syrian and Iraqi peoples. The firm support to these peoples by the people of

the world, including the Soviet people, also played an important part. How then can all this be credited solely to Soviet nuclear weapons?

It is especially ridiculous that the Soviet statement also gives all the credit to Soviet nuclear weapons for the Chinese people's victory in smashing the armed provocations of U.S. imperialism in the Taiwan Straits in 1958. The Soviet paper *Krasnaya Zvezda* even said on August 25, 1963, "The nuclear might of the Soviet Union, the very country which has now been abused by the slanderers of Peking, had saved millions of Chinese from nuclear death and defended the sovereignty, security and independence of their country."

What are the facts? In August and September of 1958, the situation in the Taiwan Straits was indeed very tense as a result of aggression and provocations by the U.S. imperialists. The Soviet leaders expressed their support for China on both September 7 and 19. Although the situation in the Taiwan Straits was then tense, there was no possibility that a nuclear war would break out and no need for the Soviet Union to support China with its nuclear weapons. It was only when they were clear on this being the situation that the Soviet leaders expressed their support for China.

We have not forgotten and will not forget the support the Soviet people have long given China on the question of Taiwan.

Likewise, however, we have not forgotten and will not forget what the Soviet leader, Khrushchov, said about the question of Taiwan after his visit to the United States in October 1959.

He said that the question of Taiwan was an incendiary factor in the international situation and that because the United States supported Chiang Kai-shek and the Soviet Union supported China, the atmosphere was like that on the eve of a great war; but the Soviet Union stood for the crea-

tion of all conditions to ease international tension and eliminate war.

He said further that there was more than one way to solve every complicated question, depending on what basis you took. For example, after the October Revolution, the Far Eastern Republic was established in the Soviet Far East, and Lenin recognized it at the time; this was a temporary concession and sacrifice, since later on it was united with Russia.

The meaning of this statement by the Soviet leader was quite clear. To put it bluntly, it was asking China to agree to the U.S. scheme of creating "two Chinas."

This absurd view was of course rebutted and rejected by China, whereupon the Soviet leader made several speeches hinting that China was "craving for war like a cock for a fight," and, like Trotsky, wanted "neither peace nor war," etc.

In accordance with the procedure mutually agreed upon by the Soviet Union and the United States, the Chiang Kai-shek clique, swaggering like a sovereign state, has now signed the tripartite treaty. Not only has the Soviet leader asked the Chinese Government to sign the same tripartite treaty along with the Chiang Kai-shek clique spurned by the Chinese people, and thus to create a two Chinas situation, he has also threatened that, if the Chinese Government opposed this treaty and refused to be bound by it, the United States would help the Chiang Kai-shek clique to manufacture nuclear weapons. It turns out that in order to "save millions of Chinese from nuclear death," one China has to become two Chinas! It is evident that the Soviet leaders will stop at nothing in order to curry favour with the U.S. imperialists. The international position of the German Democratic Republic is beneath their notice and so is China's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Although the truth has been so fully exposed, they still assert that the nuclear strength of the Soviet Union guarantees China's independence and sovereignty. What effrontery!

VII

Nuclear weapons in the hands of socialist countries should always be defensive weapons against the nuclear threats of the imperialists. In contrast to the imperialists, socialist countries have no need to use these weapons for blackmail or gambling and indeed must not do so. The question of using them concerns the interests of millions upon millions of people; and the socialist countries must be extremely prudent on this question and never act recklessly. In this connection, both adventurism and capitulationism are extremely dangerous.

During the Caribbean crisis, the Soviet leaders committed both the error of adventurism and the error of capitulationism. Instead of criticizing themselves, they have taken pride in the slap in their face, boasted of their "genuine proletarian internationalism" and proclaimed what they have called a "major victory of the policy of reason, of the forces of peace and socialism." They have wantonly attacked the Chinese Communist Party for the just position it took on this issue, alleging that China hoped for a head-on clash between the United States and the Soviet Union and tried to provoke a nuclear war. This is thoroughly disgusting.

The Soviet leaders never weary of asserting that there was a thermonuclear war crisis in the Caribbean Sea which was averted only because the Soviet leaders firmly pursued the policy of peaceful coexistence.

But the facts are there for everyone to see. Although the tension in the Caribbean Sea stemmed from the U.S. imperialist policy of aggression against Cuba and although there has been a continuing danger of U.S. imperialist invasion of Cuba, nevertheless, before the Soviet Union sent rockets into Cuba, there did not exist a critical danger of the United States using nuclear weapons in the Caribbean Sea and of a nuclear war breaking out. If it should be said that such a critical danger did arise, it was a result of the rash action of the Soviet leaders.

The Soviet leaders slanderously accuse China of having hoped for a head-on clash between the United States and the Soviet Union. The question is, did we ask you to transport rockets to Cuba? The label of adventurism cannot be pinned on us. If the Marxist-Leninist line we constantly follow had been acted on, there would never have been a question of shipping rockets to Cuba and the so-called nuclear war crisis would never have existed. How could the question of adventurism have then arisen?

We should like to ask the Soviet leaders: since the transport of rockets to Cuba was a matter of such great importance, did you ever consult the Soviet people, or the other socialist countries, or the working class in capitalist countries, about it? Without consulting anybody, you wilfully embarked on a reckless course and irresponsibly played with the lives of millions upon millions of people. The errors were of your own making, and so what ground is there for you to blame others?

There is no need whatsoever to transport rockets to Cuba in order to support the Cuban revolution. That was what the Soviet leaders said in the past, and it is also what they are saying now, and in very beautiful language. For instance, the Open Letter of July 14 of the Central Committee of the CPSU said that "in case of aggression by American imperialists we shall come to the assistance of the Cuban people from Soviet territory, just as we would have helped them from Cuban territory. True, in this case the rockets would take slightly longer in the flight, but their accuracy would not be impaired by this." That being so, why did you have to ship rockets to Cuba? Was your purpose really to defend the Cuban revolution? Would it not be more correct to say that what you did in the name of defending the Cuban revolution was in reality political gambling?

Anyone with common sense will ask: since the rockets were introduced, why did they afterwards have to be withdrawn? And inasmuch as the rockets were withdrawn afterwards,

why had they to be introduced before? According to you, there was a great deal of finesse in first putting them in and then taking them out. The withdrawal of the Soviet rockets is said to have gained in exchange a guarantee from the United States that it would refrain from invading Cuba. The Americans have said there was no such guarantee. You have said there was. But where is the guarantee? Do you really believe that the United States will not invade Cuba again? Unfortunately, you do not seem to have much confidence in that.

The Soviet leaders have said that China was opposed to the withdrawal of the rockets from Cuba and to the efforts of the Soviet Union to avert a nuclear war. This is a completely groundless statement. As we were totally opposed to your sending the rockets in, why should we oppose their withdrawal? It is understandable you should have tried to extricate yourselves from difficulties of your own creation. But we were resolutely opposed to your acceptance of the completely unjustifiable and humiliating terms which the U.S. imperialists advanced.

The Soviet leaders blame China for not having supported them as an ally should. You had better look up the documents. Was there anything you did right during the Caribbean crisis on which we did not support you? You are dissatisfied, but exactly what did you want us to support?

Did you want us to support you in your decision to accept the inspection of Soviet ships on the high seas by the U.S. pirates? That would not have done! If we had given you support on that, we would have done a disservice to the great Soviet people.

Did you want us to support you in your acceptance of the U.S. imperialists' demand for the "international inspection" of Cuba? That would not have done! If we had given you support on that, we would have done a disservice to the great Cuban people.

In recklessly introducing the rockets into Cuba and then humiliatingly withdrawing them, the Soviet leaders moved

from adventurism to capitulationism, and brought disgrace to the Soviet people, the Cuban people, the people of the countries in the socialist camp and the people of the whole world. They have inflicted unprecedented shame and humiliation on the international proletariat. All this has been unalterably written into history. No matter how the Soviet leaders lie or what sleight of hand they perform, they can never wash away their shame.

The capitulation of the Soviet leaders has inflated the aggressiveness and arrogance of the imperialists.

After the Caribbean crisis, when the U.S. imperialists saw that their policy of nuclear blackmail had succeeded, they concluded that Moscow was more afraid of atomic war than Washington. Like any fortune hunter who gets a windfall, the U.S. imperialists became overweeningly arrogant. Now that they fully understand the weaknesses of the Soviet leaders, they are using both tough and soft tactics to force them into further capitulation.

The signing of the tripartite treaty is the hallmark of such further capitulation to U.S. imperialism on the part of the Soviet leaders.

VIII

The position and line of the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese Government on the question of war and peace have always been clear and cannot be distorted.

We resolutely oppose world war and we resolutely defend world peace. Not long after World War II, Comrade Mao Tse-tung stated definitely that a third world war can be prevented. For over a decade, the Chinese people have firmly persisted in the struggle to oppose the imperialist policies of aggression and war, to prevent a new world war and to preserve world peace. We have consistently held that provided the people of the whole world become united, follow a correct

line and persevere in struggle, a new world war can be prevented, a nuclear war can be prevented, and world peace can be preserved.

It is our view that imperialism is the source of modern wars and that U.S. imperialism is the main force of aggression and war. Unless a resolute struggle is waged against the U.S. imperialist policies of aggression and war, defence of world peace is completely out of the question. If one prettifies U.S. imperialism and obscures the targets of this struggle from the people of the world, this will only endanger world peace.

It is our view that in order to strive for world peace, it is necessary to unite in joint efforts all the peace-loving forces of the world, namely, the socialist camp, the national liberation movement, the revolutionary movement of the people of all countries, and all the peace-loving countries and people. If one despises the force of the masses of the people and blindly trusts nuclear weapons as omnipotent, it will only endanger world peace.

It is our view that in order to strive for world peace, it is necessary to strengthen the unity of the socialist camp and enhance the strength of the national defences of all the countries in the socialist camp. If one splits the socialist camp and weakens its defence forces, it will only endanger world peace.

It is our view that in order to strive for world peace, it is necessary to give full support to the national liberation movement and the revolutionary struggles of the people of all countries. The more these struggles develop, the more the imperialist forces will be weakened and the greater the possibility of preventing the imperialists from launching world war. If one refuses to support, and even sabotages, the national liberation movement and the revolutionary struggle of the people of all countries, it will only endanger world peace.

We consistently maintain that countries with different social systems should coexist peacefully. It was China which initiated the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. It has made unremitting efforts for peaceful coexistence on the

basis of the Five Principles with countries having different social systems. For the socialist countries, peaceful coexistence must in all circumstances be based on principles and must not depart from them. Negotiation is one form of struggle against imperialism. Necessary compromises can be made in negotiations, so long as the principle of upholding the people's fundamental interests is observed. But if one regards negotiations as the main means, or even the sole means, of striving for peaceful coexistence and does not scruple to sell out the people's fundamental interests in order to seek compromises with imperialism, that is not peaceful coexistence but capitulationist coexistence. And it will only result in endangering world peace.

We are in favour of general disarmament and hold that the imperialists can be forced to accept certain agreements on disarmament through the unremitting struggle of the people of all countries. We are of the opinion that the complete and thorough prohibition of nuclear weapons can be achieved while imperialism still exists, just as poison gas was prohibited. The reason is that the use of such a weapon of mass destruction is completely contrary to the will of the people and would, moreover, subject the users to destruction. However, universal and complete disarmament can be realized only after imperialism, capitalism and all systems of exploitation have been eliminated. To make propaganda about the possibility of realizing "a world without weapons, without armed forces and without wars" through universal and complete disarmament while imperialism is still in existence, is to deceive the people of the world and is detrimental to the struggle for world peace.

We hold that while affirming the growing possibility that imperialism can be prevented from launching a new world war, one should also recognize that the danger of a new world war still exists. Necessary preparations must be made against this danger. The better we are prepared, the smaller the possibility that the imperialists will dare to launch such a war,

If anyone stresses only one possibility, i.e., the possibility that imperialism will not launch such a war, tries to make the people of the world believe that no other possibility exists, and does not even dare think of the other possibility, it will only lull the vigilance of the world's people, provide opportunities for imperialism to exploit and increase the danger of world war.

In fighting imperialism, we are of the opinion that, strategically and with regard to the whole, one must despise the enemy, dare to struggle against him and dare to seize victory; at the same time, tactically and with regard to each specific struggle, one must take the enemy seriously and be prudent. If one does not take full account of the enemy tactically and is heedless and reckless, while strategically one dares not despise the enemy, it is inevitable that one will commit the error of adventurism in tactics and that of capitulationism in strategy.

The position and line of the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese Government on the question of war and peace are in full conformity with the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement. Ours is a Marxist-Leninist line. Adherence to this line will lead both to victory for the peoples' revolutions and to victory for world peace.

We maintain that the line pursued by the Soviet leaders is an anti-Marxist-Leninist line, one that runs counter to the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement. Adherence to this line will harm the fundamental interests of the people of all countries, and it will endanger world peace.

Our line on the question of war and peace is indeed the diametrical opposite of that of the Soviet leaders. They are of course entitled to defend their own line. However, abuse is not debate and misrepresentation is not argument. Communists should always have respect for the facts and talk reason. It is for the Chinese people, the Soviet people and the people of the whole world to judge which line is correct, ours or yours, and which line is wrong. We note that the Soviet papers have published our statement of August 15. We hope you will continue this good practice and also publish our present statement.

SPEECH AT THE PEKING MASS RALLY, AUGUST 1, 1963, IN SUPPORT OF THE NINTH WORLD CONFERENCE AGAINST ATOMIC AND HYDROGEN BOMBS

—DELIVERED BY LIAO CHENG-CHIH, VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE CHINA PEACE COMMITTEE AND CHAIRMAN OF THE CHINESE COMMITTEE FOR AFRO-ASIAN SOLIDARITY

Comrades and Friends:

We, the people, representing all circles of the population of our capital, are gathered here today at this rally to voice our support for the 9th World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs due to be held in Hiroshima, Japan, to express our deep interest in the Hiroshima conference and to wish it positive achievements. Here, on behalf of the Chinese people, I would like to extend hearty greetings to the Japanese people, who are carrying on a heroic struggle for the prohibition of nuclear weapons and against U.S. imperialism.

The World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs was initiated by the Japanese people; from the very beginning it received the support of the people of the world and it has now become an international conference with a glorious militant tradition.

The questions discussed and the documents adopted at the previous conferences expressed the common will of the Japanese people and all the peace-loving people of the world. Those conferences clearly pointed out to the world that **U.S. imperialism is the enemy of peace; that the root cause of the threat of nuclear war is U.S. imperialism; that prevention of nuclear war, the movement to defend world peace and the national independence movement are indivisible; that the**

testing, manufacture, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons must be completely banned and all existing nuclear weapons destroyed and that the movement against atomic and hydrogen bombs must be linked up with the struggles against foreign military bases and military treaties of aggression. These correct conclusions of the previous conferences have forcefully exposed and dealt telling blows against the U.S. imperialist policies of war and aggression and shown clearly the people of the world the path they should take in their struggle against nuclear war. They have greatly inspired and encouraged the people of Japan and the world in their anti-imperialist struggle and have made positive contributions to the cause of defending world peace.

The achievements of the World Conferences Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs are inseparably linked with the heroic struggle of the Japanese people. Since the 8th World Conference, the Japanese people's just and patriotic struggle against U.S. imperialism has surged to a new height. In order to oppose the Japan-U.S. "Security Treaty" and the "Japan-ROK Talks," to strive for the recovery of Okinawa and the withdrawal of U.S. military bases and U.S. troops, and in particular to oppose the stationing in Japan of U.S. nuclear submarines and F-105D planes, the Japanese people have launched one gigantic national united action after another. Up to yesterday, there have already been twelve such nationwide united actions. In these struggles, the Japanese people fully displayed their dauntless spirit of daring to wage a tit-for-tat struggle against U.S. imperialism and have shown their will and determination to unite in a common struggle against their enemy. The Japanese people's united actions have dealt heavy blows at the strategic measures in the Far East taken by U.S. imperialism to turn Japan into a base for nuclear war.

The Chinese people have consistently supported the Japanese people's just and patriotic anti-U.S. struggle and have consistently supported all the correct conclusions of the previous World Conferences Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs de-

manding the prohibition of nuclear weapons and opposing nuclear war. **On the eve of the 9th World Conference, the Japanese Communist Party clearly set forth the following five militant tasks for the current movement to ban nuclear weapons: (1) prevent the entrance of U.S. nuclear submarines into Japanese ports and oppose the stationing of F-105D planes in Japan; (2) oppose nuclear war; prevent the arming of Japan with nuclear weapons; demand the removal of U.S. military bases and the return of Okinawa; oppose the arming of the "self-defence forces" with nuclear weapons and the transformation of Japan into a missile base; (3) demand the conclusion of an international agreement to ban all nuclear weapons, including the use, manufacture, stockpiling and testing of nuclear weapons; (4) turn the Asian and Pacific region into a nuclear-free zone; and (5) aid victims of nuclear weapons. We are of the opinion that these proposals of the Japanese Communist Party are completely correct. We are confident that through the joint efforts of the Japanese Communist Party and all the patriotic and progressive forces, with the active participation of the broad masses of the Japanese people and with the support of the peace-loving countries and people of the world, the 9th World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs will achieve even greater successes.**

Comrades and Friends! On the eve of the 9th World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs, the struggle of the people of the world for the prohibition of nuclear weapons and against nuclear war is confronted with an extraordinarily acute and complicated situation. **A treaty for a partial nuclear test ban was initialled by the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union in Moscow on July 25. This is a treaty to consolidate the nuclear monopoly of the three nuclear powers and bind the hands of all the peace-loving countries subjected to the nuclear threat. This is a treaty which runs diametrically counter to the interests of the people of the world. It is a big fraud to fool the people of the world.** The Chinese Government issued a statement on July 31,

thoroughly exposing the reactionary nature of this treaty which undermines world peace and harms the people of the world. In order to make this point clear, let us make a brief analysis of this treaty.

First, this is a treaty of fake peace and real preparation for war. The people of the world unanimously oppose the imperialist arms drive and war preparations; they demand an effective defence of world peace and unanimously demand the complete and thorough prohibition of nuclear weapons and the elimination of the nuclear threat. But this treaty completely divorces the cessation of nuclear tests from the total prohibition of nuclear weapons. Far from contributing anything to the cessation of the nuclear arms race and the elimination of the nuclear war threat, it legalizes the continued manufacture, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons by the three nuclear powers.

In his radio and television speech on July 26 Kennedy said outright that "this treaty does not mean an end to the threat of nuclear war, it will not reduce nuclear stockpiles, it will not halt the production of nuclear weapons, and it will not restrict their use in time of war." He added, "This treaty is not the millennium. It will not resolve all conflicts." From this it can be seen that this treaty not only will have no restraining effect on the U.S. imperialist policy of increasing nuclear armaments, but will greatly help U.S. imperialism to step up its preparations for nuclear war.

Secondly, this is a treaty which helps the development of nuclear weapons by U.S. imperialism and restricts non-nuclear countries from gaining nuclear self-defence capability. The people of the world demand a complete ban on nuclear weapon tests and want to achieve the further goal of completely and thoroughly banning nuclear weapons. But this treaty only prohibits nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, and permits continued underground nuclear tests. Thus U.S. imperialism is given a legal right whereby it can unscrupulously utilize underground nu-

clear tests to improve its strategic nuclear weapons and develop its tactical ones. Referring to the fact that the treaty on a partial nuclear test ban permits underground nuclear tests, Kennedy said, "This treaty is a limited treaty which permits continued underground tests and prohibits only those tests that we ourselves can police." He further said that "the United States has deliberately chosen to concentrate on more mobile and more efficient weapons, with lower but entirely sufficient yield."

We must point out that U.S. imperialism already has an adequate stockpile of strategic nuclear weapons, that through over two hundred nuclear tests, it has gained the necessary technical data for manufacturing nuclear weapons, and that at present its requirements can be met even with just underground nuclear tests. Therefore it is not U.S. imperialism but those countries which have not yet gained nuclear self-defence capability that are restricted by this treaty on a partial nuclear test ban. So one of the main aims of this treaty is to prevent the non-nuclear countries, especially the non-nuclear socialist countries, from ever gaining nuclear self-defence capability. If non-nuclear countries work to gain nuclear self-defence capability, U.S. imperialism can use this as a pretext to tear up this treaty at any time and resume nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, and at the same time shift the responsibility onto others. On the very next day after the initialling of the treaty, Kennedy declared to the world: "Our own vigilance and strength must be maintained, as we remain ready to withdraw and to resume all forms of testing, if we must."

Thirdly, this is a treaty that allows the U.S. imperialists to export nuclear weapons at will. The people of the world demand that U.S. imperialism dismantle all its military bases, including nuclear bases, and oppose its arming of West Germany and Japan with nuclear weapons. But this treaty, which runs counter to this urgent desire of the people of the world, permits U.S. imperialism, as in the past, to strengthen its world

network of military bases, including nuclear bases, to install various kinds of nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them in all the areas under its control, and to step up implementation of the plan for a so-called "multilateral nuclear force." In his recent speech Kennedy openly declared that this treaty "will not reduce our need for arms or allies or programmes of assistance to others." We can be perfectly sure that following the conclusion of this treaty, U.S. imperialism will certainly be even more unbridled in carrying out the above-mentioned criminal activities.

Fourthly, this is a treaty which consolidates the nuclear monopoly of the nuclear powers and facilitates their continued posing of a nuclear threat. The people of the world are resolutely opposed to the destiny of the people of the world being manipulated by a few big powers monopolizing nuclear weapons. The nations and peoples subjected to oppression and aggression have already suffered greatly from big-power chauvinism; and this treaty is the concentrated expression of big-power chauvinism.

Some people may argue that though this is not a good treaty it is better to have one than to have none. Is it really so? No, absolutely not! As has been pointed out already, this is a treaty which is advantageous to U.S. imperialism for maintaining its nuclear monopoly, gaining a nuclear superiority, continuing its nuclear blackmail and stepping up its nuclear war preparations, but binding the hands of all the countries and people subjected to oppression and aggression. It not only fails to solve any practical problems with regard to the prohibition of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war or in any degree reduce the danger of a nuclear war, but covers up the truth of the matter and gives an illusory sense of security to the people of the world. This is precisely why it makes it easier for the U.S. imperialists to delude the people of the world and lull their vigilance and also makes it legal for them to increase their nuclear armaments

and prepare for a nuclear war. Therefore, it is worse to have this treaty than not to have it.

Some people may say that things always proceed step by step and that when it is impossible completely to ban nuclear weapons and eliminate the danger of nuclear war, the conclusion of a treaty on the partial prohibition of nuclear tests is after all a forward step to be welcomed. Now the U.S. imperialists and their accomplices are everywhere with one voice propagandizing the idea that the conclusion of the treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests by them is the first step towards the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. Is it actually so? No, this is a complete lie!

As everyone knows, the United States has stockpiled large quantities of nuclear warheads and possesses a great number of guided missiles and aircraft for delivering them, and these weapons are scattered about in various parts of the world. What is more, since 1961, Kennedy has ordered that one-eighth of all the U.S. heavy bombers carrying nuclear bombs should be on airborne patrol day and night. These actions of the United States constitute a serious menace to the security of all peoples and cause universal anxiety. If the United States really is sincere in taking the first step in prohibiting nuclear weapons, it should, first of all, remove its nuclear threat to other countries, immediately dismantle all its military bases, including nuclear bases, on foreign soil; withdraw from abroad all its nuclear equipment, nuclear submarines and aircraft carrying nuclear weapons, and in deference to the desire of the people of all countries, reach agreement with the countries concerned on the establishment of zones free of nuclear weapons. The United States, however, has all along obstinately refused to do all this. Obviously, U.S. imperialism is not willing to take any practical step towards the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. The reason why the United States has been so keen on concluding a treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests is just because such a treaty in no way touches its programme of increasing nuclear arms and nuclear

war preparations. On the contrary, the treaty makes it easier for the United States to carry out its nuclear threat and blackmail. We would like to ask: How can the signing of such a treaty be described as a "forward step" in the struggle to ban nuclear weapons and to oppose nuclear war?

Some persons may perhaps say that the signing of this treaty may anyway reduce atomic contamination of the air and water and produce a sense of relief. True, a temporary suspension of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water will somewhat reduce atomic contamination. But this treaty was by no means signed for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of the people. On the contrary, the treaty not only allows the nuclear powers to resume at any moment their nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, but also increases the danger of a nuclear war. It is proper and understandable for the people of the world to demand the stopping of nuclear tests and the elimination of the danger of radioactive substances. But it is absolutely intolerable for the imperialists to exploit the people's desire for peace and engage in double-dealing so as to achieve their goal of preparing a nuclear war.

Some persons perhaps may say that it may be safer anyhow if the number of nuclear powers is small and not large. But such is not the actual state of affairs. As is well known, the atom bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki back in 1945 are so far the only atom bombs ever used in war. Those two atom bombs were dropped not at a time when a considerable number of countries were in possession of nuclear weapons but at a time when the United States had the exclusive monopoly of nuclear weapons. That was the inception of the nuclear catastrophe which led to the struggle of the people of Japan and the world against atomic and hydrogen bombs. The facts are very clear: **Nuclear weapons are not the source of war; the source of war lies in U.S. imperialism from which the threat of nuclear war also comes. In order to remove the threat of nuclear war, the only thing to do is for the people**

of the world to get united and wage a resolute struggle against U.S. imperialism and to compel it to destroy all its nuclear stockpiles and guarantee not to produce any more nuclear weapons. Before this aim is achieved, the only effective way to avert the threat of a nuclear war is for more socialist and other peace-loving countries to possess nuclear self-defence capability. Only thus will U.S. imperialism not dare to act rashly and unleash a nuclear war at will.

The partial nuclear test ban treaty initialled by the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union is nothing new. It is an undeniable fact that it is actually a reproduction of the draft treaty on a partial halting of nuclear tests put forward by the United States and Britain a year ago at the meeting of the Disarmament Committee in Geneva, which so glaringly defended the interests of imperialism to the detriment of the socialist countries. The U.S. bourgeois political commentator Walter Lippmann has said: "The draft of the test ban treaty, which has been worked out in Moscow by Khrushchov, Harriman and Hailsham, is, it appears, substantially the same treaty we offered the Soviet Union nearly a year ago on August 27, 1962." Lippmann even considered that "this proposal in turn was very like the one made by President Eisenhower to Chairman Khrushchov on April 13, 1959." The Kyodo News Agency of Japan also held the view that the partial test ban treaty just initialled in Moscow was by and large similar to the draft put forward by the United States and Britain last year and that in some respects it coincides with the U.S.-British draft even in minor wording. It is easy to see that the imperialists are of course glad to sign such a treaty.

The Soviet Government once clearly rejected the draft treaty put forward by the United States and Britain, pointing out that it was a draft detrimental to "the interests of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries." According to Tass, the head of the Soviet delegation Kuznetsov severely criticized this U.S.-British draft for not hindering underground nuclear tests. He said that this was speculating on the humanity of all mankind in an attempt to get public support for a programme which contained a serious threat to the lives of millions upon millions of people. He asked: Could one forget that the United States should be held responsible not only for its conducting of nuclear weapon tests, but also for the use of nuclear weapons against the millions of defenceless inhabitants of Hiroshima and Nagasaki? Kuznetsov also referred to another serious danger contained in the Anglo-American proposal, that is that the proposal was obviously aimed at providing the Western powers with a one-sided military advantage to the detriment of the interests of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. He noted that the United States had been using underground tests to improve its nuclear weapons for many years already, and that should underground nuclear tests be legalized with a simultaneous prohibition of such tests in the atmosphere, this would mean that the United States could continue improving its nuclear weapons and increase their yield and effectiveness, whereas the Soviet Union would have its hands bound in the question of strengthening its defence potentiality.

In 1961, when U.S. President Kennedy and British Prime Minister Macmillan issued a joint statement proposing a halt in atmospheric tests but allowing underground and high altitude tests, the Soviet Union resolutely rejected it. In criticizing this joint statement, the Soviet Government head Khrushchov said, "This is not the first time the Governments of the United States and Britain have sought to confine a nuclear test ban to tests in the atmosphere alone. They made similar proposals, for instance, in 1959. Why has the Soviet Government always been against such an approach to the question of discontinuing nuclear weapon tests? Because agreement on the cessation of one kind of tests only — in the atmosphere — would be a disservice to the cause of peace. It would mean deceiving the peoples. Such agreement could create the harmful and dangerous illusion among the peoples that steps were being taken to put an end to the arms race, while in fact nothing of the kind would have been done." Khrushchov further said,

"The conclusion of an agreement that started a kind of race in underground nuclear tests, and if you like, in outer space or under water, could be assessed by the peoples, and with good reason at that, as a dishonest deal. Of course, the Soviet Government cannot and will not strike such a bargain. A deal of this nature is wanted by those who build their policy on deceit of the peoples, on playing at negotiation."

Not too much time has passed since then but the Soviet Government, making a 180-degree about-face turn, has discarded its former correct stand by accepting a reproduction of the U.S.-British draft and made a deal with the U.S. and British imperialists to deceive the people. This is capitulation to imperialism and a gross selling-out of the interests of the socialist countries and of the people of the world.

It is by no means accidental that the Soviet Union should have collaborated with the U.S. and British imperialists in signing such a treaty which runs counter to the interests of the people of the world. After the treaty was initialled, the U.S. representative Harriman said it had been possible to reach agreement on this treaty because Khrushchov "very much wanted one at this time." As everybody knows, in the past few years the Soviet leaders have all along been anxious to make a deal with U.S. imperialism in order to push ahead the Soviet "general line of peaceful coexistence" and to dictate the destiny of the people of the world in collusion with U.S. imperialism. Yet because U.S. imperialism refused to yield one inch to them, they not only failed to achieve anything but found themselves in an increasingly difficult position. In these circumstances, the Soviet leaders have not hesitated to lower the price again and again and even capitulate to U.S. imperialism in return for "coexistence" with it. The signing of this treaty is an inevitable outcome of the Soviet leaders' implementation of this line.

The conclusion by the Soviet Union of the partial test ban treaty, which goes against the interests of the people of the world, with U.S. and British imperialism is a most unseemly

affair. Yet the Soviet leaders and the Soviet press extolled the treaty to the skies. The press of the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and other countries and of the French and Italian Communist Parties are tailing after the Soviet Union in raising a chorus of cheers. They say that this treaty is "of great international importance," "a good start," "a great triumph for the policy of peaceful coexistence" and a "turning-point in the history of mankind." Their purpose in so exerting themselves to prettify this treaty is no other than to use it as a shot in the arm to bolster up their revisionist theories which have long gone bankrupt. They try to use the signing of this treaty to prove that the nature of imperialism is changeable, that the heads of a few big powers can dictate the destiny of the people of the world, that world peace can be got easily and that the anti-imperialist struggle of the people of the world is unnecessary. All this is absurd and is a capitulationist viewpoint absolutely unacceptable to revolutionary Communists and the revolutionary people.

Comrades and Friends! We can now clearly see that the conclusion of the treaty for a partial nuclear test ban represents a big conspiracy in which the imperialists and their hangers-on join hands against the socialist countries, against China and against the forces of peace of the whole world. It is a big conspiracy against the interests of the people of the world and the cause of world peace. In its statement the Chinese Government has expressed its determined opposition to this dirty treaty and its resolute refusal to be a party to this dirty fraud; it has exposed that fraud with a high sense of responsibility to the people of the world. We, the Chinese people, fully support this just stand of our Government.

Like the other peoples of the world, the Chinese people are firmly opposed to a nuclear war and to a world war. The Chinese Government and people have consistently and resolutely stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. The Chinese Government has, since long ago, proposed time and again the establishment of a zone

free from nuclear weapons in the Asian and Pacific region, including the United States. And now the Chinese Government has in a clear-cut and systematic way put forward in its statement proposals concerning the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. They are:

(1) All countries in the world, both nuclear and non-nuclear, solemnly declare that they will prohibit and destroy nuclear weapons completely, thoroughly, totally and resolutely. Concretely speaking, they will not use nuclear weapons, nor export, nor import, nor manufacture, nor test, nor stockpile them; and they will destroy all the existing nuclear weapons and their means of delivery in the world, and disband all existing establishments for the research, testing and manufacture of nuclear weapons in the world.

(2) In order to fulfil the above undertakings step by step, the following measures shall be adopted first:

a. Dismantle all military bases, including nuclear bases, on foreign soil, and withdraw from abroad all nuclear weapons and their means of delivery.

b. Establish a nuclear weapon-free zone of the Asian and Pacific region, including the United States, the Soviet Union, China and Japan; a nuclear weapon-free zone of Central Europe; a nuclear weapon-free zone of Africa; and a nuclear weapon-free zone of Latin America. The countries possessing nuclear weapons shall undertake due obligations with regard to each of the nuclear weapon-free zones.

c. Refrain from exporting and importing in any form nuclear weapons and technical data for their manufacture.

d. Cease all nuclear tests, including underground nuclear tests.

(3) A conference of the government heads of all the countries of the world shall be convened to discuss the question of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and the question of taking the above-mentioned four measures in order to realize step by step the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons.

These proposals of the Chinese Government not only reflect the Chinese people's aspirations, but also conform to the interests of the people of the world. The Chinese people resolutely support the statement of their Government. We are confident that the Chinese Government's stand will surely enjoy the understanding, sympathy and support of the people of the world. As in the past, the Chinese people will stand together with other peoples of the world and fight to the end for the complete, thorough, total and resolute prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons.

The struggle for the prohibition of nuclear weapons is not an isolated one. It is closely linked with the struggles of the people of the world against the imperialist policies of war and aggression, in defence of world peace and for national liberation, people's democracy and socialism. Today, the struggle of the people of the world in defence of world peace and the revolutionary struggle of the oppressed nations and peoples are continuously scoring new victories. In such a highly favourable situation, all socialist countries and Communists throughout the world should, of course, stand together with all the oppressed peoples and nations and the broad masses of the peace-loving people and guide them in steadfast struggle and advance from victory to victory. But at this important juncture, a handful of people have actually betrayed the revolutionary cause of the people of the world and regarding enemies as friends, have colluded with the imperialists in an attempt to arbitrarily check the advance of the wheel of history. This has confronted the forthcoming 9th World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs in Japan with a complicated international situation. Within Japan, the U.S. imperialists, the Japanese reactionaries and their cohorts are conspiring to disrupt the unity of the patriotic and democratic forces and sabotage the Japanese people's struggle for a ban on nuclear weapons and nuclear warfare and against U.S. imperialism and to undermine the 9th World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs. This has also added to the difficulties of

the conference. Nevertheless, we are confident that the nationally conscious Japanese people, experienced in the fight against imperialism, will succeed in strengthening their unity and overcoming the difficulties before them and, together with the people all over the world, carry forward the movement for the prohibition of nuclear weapons and against nuclear war, thus enabling the 9th World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs to achieve positive results as all the previous conferences have done, and to make new contributions to the cause of opposing imperialism and defending world peace.

In conclusion, let us shout:

For a complete, thorough, total and resolute prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons!

Oppose the nuclear fraud of the tripartite treaty!

Oppose the U.S. imperialist policy of nuclear threat and blackmail!

Oppose U.S. imperialism turning Japan into a nuclear base!

Oppose U.S. imperialism arming Japan with nuclear weapons!

Dismantle U.S. imperialists' military and nuclear bases throughout the world!

U.S. imperialism, get out of Japan! Get out of Taiwan! Get out of Asia! Get out of all the places it has occupied!

Salute the valiant Japanese people!

Long live the great unity of the people of the whole world!

Long live world peace!

U.S. NUCLEAR FRAUD EXPOSED

"Renmin Ribao" Editorial, July 19, 1963

Talks on a nuclear test ban are being held in Moscow by the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union. In view of the fact that the United States is making continued efforts to manufacture and stockpile nuclear weapons in large quantities, to prepare for nuclear war and to carry out its policy of nuclear blackmail, an ever increasing demand for a total prohibition of nuclear weapons and for opposing nuclear warfare has been raised by all peace-loving countries and peoples of the world. This demand and aspiration of the peoples of the world has found concentrated expression in the World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs held annually in Japan. It is only natural, therefore, that people will pin hopes on the tripartite Moscow talks.

The Chinese Government always stands opposed to nuclear war and has consistently advocated a total prohibition of nuclear weapons. We stand for a ban on the use, manufacture, stockpiling and testing of nuclear weapons and for the destruction of all existing nuclear weapons. The danger of a nuclear war today comes from the fact that U.S. imperialism possesses large quantities of nuclear weapons, is day and night manufacturing more and threatening to use them. How can the danger of nuclear war be eliminated if an end is not put to this situation? That is why only by totally prohibiting nuclear weapons can a nuclear war be effectively prevented.

However, negotiations for general disarmament and a total ban on nuclear arms in the past few years bear witness to the fact that U.S. imperialism and its followers have put up a

thousand and one pretexts in persistently refusing to agree to a total ban on nuclear arms, raising one obstacle after another in the talks. What is more, they have attempted to throw the responsibility for the failure to achieve a total ban on nuclear weapons onto the Soviet Union. This is absolutely unjustifiable.

The socialist countries have no need for nuclear weapons in the first place and, what is more, they are firmly opposed to nuclear war. Nuclear weapons were first manufactured by the United States. Only in order to resist imperialist nuclear blackmail do the socialist countries find it necessary to possess such weapons. The Soviet Union has consistently worked for their total prohibition. How can one shift to the Soviet Union the blame for the failure so far to reach an agreement on banning these weapons?

The socialist countries' persistent stand for a total ban on nuclear arms has the support of an ever increasing number of peace-loving nations and peoples. Under the mounting pressure of the peoples of the world, the United States has to resort all the more to deceitful tactics to achieve its objective of preventing a ban on nuclear weapons. It has laid aside the question of a total ban on nuclear arms, and put forward the proposal for the termination or partial termination of nuclear testing, to divert the peoples' attention.

The United States has, through more than 200 tests, acquired the necessary technical data for the manufacture of nuclear weapons and has officially announced that it has stockpiled 25,000 nuclear warheads. Therefore, a suspension of nuclear testing will not in any way hinder its continued manufacture of nuclear weapons and its continued pursuit of nuclear blackmail. On the other hand, the United States can use suspension to create a pressure of public opinion to prevent socialist countries other than the Soviet Union from conducting nuclear tests and possessing nuclear capability, thus preventing the socialist camp from reinforcing its power to resist U.S. nuclear blackmail.

U.S. imperialism has made no secret of all this. U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk said on March 11 that the various types of nuclear weapons the United States possessed today "are useful for a variety of strategic and tactical uses," and that if a nuclear test ban treaty was concluded, the U.S. "military position might well be more secure." U.S. Under-Secretary of State, Averell Harriman, went a step further when he said on June 21, "One of the reasons why we had hoped we could come to an agreement with the Soviet Union and the British on a test ban was that that might stop the proliferation [of nuclear weapons] and that we could work together to prevent China from getting a nuclear capability."

Obviously, the United States proposal for the cessation of nuclear testing is an out-and-out fraud.

What is of more serious consequence is that to cease nuclear tests according to the U.S. proposal may give rise to a false sense of security among the peoples and lull their vigilance in their struggle to defend peace. In September 1961 the Soviet Government correctly pointed out in its memorandum on nuclear weapon tests to the 16th Session of the U.N. General Assembly, "It became clear that the conclusion of a separate treaty on discontinuing nuclear tests at a time when the Western powers were pursuing a reckless arms race could only create a general illusion that something was being done to prevent a nuclear war, whereas the Western powers were actually pushing matters precisely to such a war. The conclusion of a treaty on discontinuing nuclear tests in such an atmosphere and in isolation from a programme for general and complete disarmament could only give the peoples of the world a false sense of security, and would act as a kind of drug to lull their vigilance on the question of the preservation of peace." Thus, if this U.S. fraud should succeed, the pursuit of nuclear blackmail and the danger of a nuclear war would not be reduced but would increase greatly.

What serves to reveal the sinister motives of the United States most tellingly is its proposal for partial cessation of

nuclear tests to the exclusion of the underground ones. This proposal clearly shows that it has no intention at all of prohibiting nuclear weapons.

H. Bethe, former member of the U.S. President's Science Advisory Committee and Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission and Defence Department, said that the United States must carry on underground tests because such tests had a practical military effect. Everybody knows that through underground tests the capability of strategic nuclear weapons can be improved and tactical nuclear weapons tested and developed. The U.S. underground nuclear tests in the recent period were conducted for these very purposes.

Some kind-hearted people may believe that cessation of nuclear tests, whether total or partial, represents a step forward towards a total ban on nuclear weapons and therefore should be welcomed. In view of the fact that the U.S. atmospheric nuclear tests in the Pacific have seriously threatened the health and even lives of inhabitants in this region, peoples' pressing desire for the cessation of these tests is legitimate and fully understandable. But we should not allow imperialism to exploit this desire to attain an objective contrary to the wishes of the broad masses of the people.

At present the nuclear powers have acquired technical data necessary to them through a series of nuclear tests. They not only have already stockpiled large numbers of nuclear weapons but are also continuing to manufacture them. In these circumstances the step that is of real practical significance is not to cease nuclear testing alone but first of all to make these countries undertake the obligation not to use and manufacture nuclear weapons. If nuclear testing alone is discontinued while those countries already in possession of nuclear weapons are allowed to continue manufacturing and stockpiling them and retain the right to use them, of what significance would such discontinuance of nuclear testing be? The cessation of nuclear tests will have positive significance only when it forms a component part of a programme for general disarma-

ment and the total prohibition of nuclear weapons. If one undertakes to stop nuclear testing as a separate measure, it will be playing right into the hands of the United States, and running counter to the aspirations of the world's peoples for a total prohibition of nuclear weapons and for the prevention of nuclear war.

We are in favour of achieving a total prohibition of nuclear weapons stage by stage. This goal may be attained by following the procedure mentioned above, or its attainment may be promoted by the establishment and expansion of nuclear weapon-free zones. Both methods hinge on the fact that the countries possessing nuclear weapons must undertake practical obligations. The Chinese Government proposed long ago that Asia and the Pacific region be turned into a nuclear weapon-free zone. The proposal clearly stipulates that the United States must be included and undertake the same obligations. We consider the establishment and expansion of other nuclear weapon-free zones to be helpful in diminishing the scope of activity of the nuclear powers and helpful to the prevention of nuclear war. But, inasmuch as nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles have been developed as they are today, it is only when the nuclear powers undertake obligations and show respect for the nuclear weapon-free zones that the aspirations of the people there can be fulfilled.

U.S. imperialism is doing its best to publicize the claim that an end to nuclear testing can prevent nuclear proliferation and reduce the danger of a nuclear war. This, too, is deceptive talk. The danger of a nuclear war comes from the United States. So long as the United States possesses nuclear weapons the danger of a nuclear war will always exist, whether or not it proliferates such weapons among other Western countries. It is true that in order to maintain its nuclear monopoly in the imperialist camp, and prevent its allies from acquiring an independent nuclear force, U.S. imperialism is engaged in bitter strife with its allies, especially with France. But one

cannot infer from this that the United States will not proliferate nuclear weapons among its allies. On the contrary, if the United States can place its allies under its control through the adoption of such projects as the "multilateral nuclear force," there is every possibility that it may supply its allies not only with nuclear weapons but also with technical data on their manufacture, to enable these countries to make and stockpile nuclear weapons, thus increasing the power of the imperialist camp to carry out nuclear blackmail against the peoples of the world. What grounds are there for saying that an agreement on termination or partial termination of nuclear tests can serve the purpose of hindering the United States from proliferating nuclear weapons? To put it bluntly, the U.S. intention is not at all to manacle the other imperialist countries but to manacle the socialist countries.

The peoples throughout the world are following closely the tripartite talks in Moscow. If the talks should fail to contribute positively to a total ban on nuclear weapons, they should at least not produce a negative effect. It was reported that before the talks began, the Soviet Government had already expressed willingness to reach an agreement with the United States on a partial cessation of nuclear tests. This situation causes us concern. Proceeding from our consistent stand of opposing imperialism and of preserving world peace, we consider it our duty to expose thoroughly the U.S. fraud in connection with termination or partial termination of nuclear tests. We hope that the Soviet Union will not fall into this trap.

World peace is being seriously threatened by the U.S. imperialist policy of nuclear war preparations and nuclear blackmail. All peace-loving countries and peoples in the world are pressing eagerly for a total ban on nuclear weapons and for the prevention of nuclear war. U.S. imperialism is cunning. We must in no circumstances allow it to attain its war purposes by taking advantage of our desire for peace. The people of the world must heighten their vigilance against the U.S. imperialist conspiratorial schemes in connection with the termination or partial termination of nuclear tests. No matter how long the road of struggle may be, we will certainly attain our goal so long as we remain cool-headed, follow a correct policy and persist in struggle. The outcome of the struggle can only be the elimination of nuclear weapons by man and not of man by nuclear weapons.

PEOPLE OF THE WORLD, UNITE! STRIVE FOR THE COMPLETE PROHIBITION AND THOROUGH DESTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS!

"Renmin Ribao" Editorial, August 2, 1963

The Chinese Government issued a statement on July 31 proposing that a conference of the government heads of all the countries of the world be convened to discuss the question of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. Following the release of this statement, U.S. imperialism and its followers hastily got their propaganda machines going and tried their best to belittle its significance, declaring that "a proposal so sweeping and unrealistic . . . stood little chance of being considered seriously."

This once again exposes the substance of the Moscow treaty stage-managed by U.S. imperialism.

In the eyes of U.S. imperialism, the countries of the world are divided into two categories: those which possess nuclear weapons and those which do not. The few nuclear powers, as a matter of course, are the masters of the world, whereas the countries which do not possess nuclear weapons are, to quote Kennedy, irresponsible and unstable, so that they are by no means qualified to possess nuclear weapons, nor can they have any say in the matter. In other words, those countries which do not possess nuclear weapons and the broad masses of people of the world must be left for ever to the tender mercies of others, and doomed to be the object of nuclear blackmail and nuclear threats.

The Washington big shots consider that it is perfectly legitimate for the three nuclear powers, the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union, to strike a bargain in Moscow behind

the backs of others and produce a so-called partial nuclear test ban treaty, and that it is no less perfectly legitimate for them to impose that Moscow treaty on the non-nuclear countries, while the non-nuclear countries, on their part, can only endorse the treaty, and are definitely prohibited from even spelling out the word "no," under pain of being accused of committing a heinous crime and charged with sacrilege against this divine law.

What smug calculations! And what insolent arrogance!

The prohibition of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war are a matter of great importance affecting each and every country and all the people of the world. What right have the few nuclear powers to take this matter into their own hands exclusively and forbid the non-nuclear countries to have their say?

To speak frankly, if in this matter in international relations the principle followed is righteousness and justice and not tyranny and brute force, then no nuclear power has any right to dictate to any non-nuclear power — it has only the duty to submit itself to the demand of the people of all countries of the world for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons.

There are more than 130 countries in the world. All countries, big or small, nuclear or non-nuclear, are equal. It is absolutely impermissible for two or three countries to brandish their nuclear weapons at will, issue orders and commands, and lord it over in the world as self-ordained nuclear overlords, while the overwhelming majority of countries are expected to kneel and obey orders meekly, as if they were nuclear slaves.

The time of power politics has gone for ever, and major questions of the world can no longer be decided by a few big powers. The question of banning nuclear weapons and preventing nuclear war must be discussed and decided jointly by all countries of the world, big and small, nuclear and non-nuclear.

When the Chinese Government proposed in its July 31 statement that a conference of the government heads of all the countries of the world be convened to discuss the question of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, it proceeded precisely from the stand of sincerely upholding world peace and of sincerely respecting the equal status of all countries. Like all other countries and peoples of the world favouring peace and treasuring independence and freedom, the Chinese Government and people stand firmly against nuclear overlords and will in no circumstances allow themselves to be treated as nuclear slaves.

In proposing that nuclear weapons be banned and destroyed completely, thoroughly, totally and resolutely, the Chinese Government outlines four concrete measures to be adopted in the first place for the step-by-step fulfilment of this undertaking. The Chinese Government's proposal reflects the ardent desire of the people all over the world. It is firm in stand and clear-cut in content, and it is also feasible.

What is behind the allegation that the Chinese Government's proposal is "sweeping and unrealistic" and that it stands "little chance of being considered seriously"? This actually exposes the U.S. imperialists' intention to use, export, manufacture, test and stockpile nuclear weapons. In a word, the United States wants to continue to push ahead with its policies of nuclear war preparations and of nuclear blackmail. A proof of this is that the very words "prohibition of nuclear weapons" are not even mentioned in the much-vaunted Moscow treaty. U.S. imperialism is stubbornly clinging to its nuclear weapon precisely because it regards it as a magic weapon for massacre and arson enabling it to lord it over in the world.

U.S. nuclear bases cover the whole world, U.S. nuclear submarines ply the waters of every ocean and U.S. aircraft carrying nuclear weapons fly over every continent. All this poses a serious menace to world peace and the security of the

people of all countries. Many countries are thus placed in the frontline of a nuclear war which the United States is preparing to unleash. The people there live constantly under the grim shadow of nuclear war. The Japanese people in particular have already been the victims of U.S. atom bombs, and for that very reason hate all the more the U.S. imperialist policy of nuclear war preparations. The people throughout the world demand the dismantling of all military bases overseas, including nuclear bases, and the evacuation of nuclear weapons and all their means of delivery including nuclear submarines and nuclear weapon carrying aircraft. Is it not absolutely fair and just for the Chinese Government to raise this universal demand in its proposal? Is it not a minimal step towards a ban on nuclear weapons?

But the U.S. imperialists say that it is unrealistic and stands no chance of being considered seriously. This clearly proves that the talk about "general and complete disarmament" in the U.S.-U.K.-U.S.S.R. treaty and Kennedy's remark that "a journey of a thousand miles must begin with a single step," are just so much eyewash!

To do away with the threat of nuclear war, the peoples of all countries demand the establishment of separate nuclear weapon-free zones in different regions of the world. In August 1960, the Chinese Government proposed the setting up of a nuclear weapon-free zone covering the Asian and Pacific region and including the United States. This proposal has received warm support from many countries in Asia and on the Pacific coasts and is regarded as "a greater step towards a peaceful world." The Polish Government proposed, as early as October 1957, the establishment of a nuclear weapon-free zone in Central Europe. Fifteen Latin American countries and 31 African countries proposed successively this year that similar zones be set up in their two continents. These proposals, too, have received widespread approval among the peoples. The Chinese Government's statement precisely embraces these proposals.

But the U.S. imperialists say that these proposals are unrealistic and stand no chance of being considered seriously. This means that the United States refuses to undertake obligations relating to the proposed nuclear weapon-free zones, refuses to pledge that it will not use nuclear weapons against the countries in these regions, and insists on using nuclear weapons in its aggression and threats against these countries. What is more, the United States actually considers itself the supreme judge and wants to supervise these regions. A few days ago, U.S. State Department officials declared, without any sense of shame, that inspection must be provided for if the African countries hoped to set up a nuclear weapon-free zone. What nonsense is this? The U.S. marauders, brandishing their nuclear weapons and committing all sorts of crimes in the world, must be exempt from inspection, while non-nuclear countries — victims of its aggression and threats — have to accept inspection! This is sheer effrontery!

The people the world over demand that all nuclear countries refrain from exporting nuclear weapons and technical data for their manufacture; they demand that all non-nuclear countries refrain from importing these weapons and the technical data for their manufacture. The Chinese Government's proposal includes precisely this universal demand.

But the U.S. imperialists declare that it is unrealistic and stands no chance of being considered seriously. This means that U.S. imperialism is determined to preserve its freedom to spread nuclear arms as it pleases, so that it may provide its allies and countries under its control with such arms. It is well known that U.S. imperialism is planning to set up a so-called "multilateral nuclear force" for the North Atlantic alliance. Its outcry about "preventing nuclear proliferation" is intended only to tie the hands of the socialist countries and prevent these countries, besides the Soviet Union, from possessing the means of resisting U.S. nuclear threats.

It stands to reason that the people throughout the world demand an end to nuclear testing in all forms as an integral

part of a total ban on nuclear weapons. Many countries have pointed out, with good reason, that a partial nuclear test ban, excluding underground tests, is devoid of any meaning and that an end must be put to all nuclear tests. The Chinese Government's proposal precisely includes this universal demand.

But the U.S. imperialists now declare that this proposal is unrealistic and stands no chance of being considered seriously. U.S. imperialism doggedly opposes a complete ban on nuclear tests and insists on underground nuclear tests because, while making continuous efforts to improve its strategic nuclear weapons, it is energetically developing tactical nuclear weapons and actively preparing to wage "limited nuclear wars" against the socialist countries and the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Both the development of tactical nuclear weapons and the improvement of strategic nuclear weapons depend on underground tests. The Moscow treaty which is lauded to the skies has deliberately left out underground nuclear tests. This exactly conforms to the desire of the United States.

Is the proposal of the Chinese Government realistic or not? The question is quite clear: to all those who genuinely desire the banning of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war, the Chinese Government's proposal is realistic; it is unrealistic only to those who have no desire at all to have nuclear weapons banned.

The Chinese Government's proposal is another major effort towards the banning of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war and is an important political move in the interests of world peace and the people of all countries. All those who are sincere in defending world peace will welcome this proposal and only U.S. imperialism which is engaged in nuclear blackmail and its partners fear it. The more they attack this proposal, the more they expose themselves as the enemy of world peace and the more they reveal their own guilty conscience.

In a sense, the Chinese Government's proposal is a mirror to show up monsters. It reflects the ugly face of U.S. imperialism which is aggressive by nature as well as the servile features of those who are warmly embracing U.S. imperialism. The exposure of these freaks and monsters in their true colours is an excellent thing for the revolutionary struggle of the peoples and the cause of defending world peace.

Nuclear weapons cannot save imperialism and its followers from their doom. The more desperately they cling to nuclear weapons, the more closely they will find themselves encircled by the world's people. Nuclear weapons can be prohibited. Nuclear war can be prevented. However great the difficulties and obstacles, the Chinese people will steadfastly persevere in their just stand and will never barter away principles. They will resolutely unite with the people of the socialist countries, with all oppressed peoples and oppressed nations and with all peace-loving countries and people of the world to struggle until victory for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and for the defence of world peace.

THIS IS BETRAYAL OF THE SOVIET PEOPLE!

"Renmin Ribao" Editorial, August 3, 1963

In concluding the partial nuclear test ban treaty the Government of the Soviet Union in partnership with the Governments of the United States and Britain has perpetrated a big fraud jeopardizing the interests of the peoples of the world and the cause of world peace. Now, the Soviet leaders and the Soviet press are doing their utmost to boost this treaty, in an attempt to increase the effect of this fraud and to lull and deceive still more the peoples of the world who oppose imperialism.

What after all is the meaning of the initialling of this treaty which divorces a ban on nuclear testing from a ban on nuclear weapons and excludes a ban on underground nuclear tests? One does not have to go to the "wild men" of the West to get the answer. The Soviet leaders and the Soviet press have provided the correct answer. They have now betrayed themselves.

In the past they declared that to sign such a treaty would "tie the hands of the Soviet Union," and would be "to the detriment of the interest of the Soviet Union and other socialist states." But now they have betrayed themselves and claim that it is a triumph of the Soviet policy of "peaceful coexistence."

In the past they declared that to sign such a treaty would help the United States "improve its nuclear weapons" and would "ensure for the Western powers unilateral military advantages." But now they have betrayed themselves and

claim that the treaty "blazes the path towards completely freeing mankind from atomic and hydrogen calamities."

In the past they declared that to sign such a treaty would be "tantamount to encouraging the aggressors to carry out their designs which are dangerous for the whole of mankind" and would be "a disservice to the cause of peace." But now they have betrayed themselves and claim that it is "a decisive step along the road to world peace."

In the past they declared that when submitting their draft treaty on August 27, 1962, the United States and Britain tried to "speculate on the humanity of all mankind." But now they have betrayed themselves and claim that the refurbished version of that draft treaty "conforms to the lofty humanitarian principle of socialism."

In the past the Soviet leader solemnly declared: "The Soviet Government cannot and will not strike such a bargain. A deal of this nature is wanted by those who build their policy on deceit of the peoples, on playing at negotiation." But now he has betrayed himself and has taken part in this same fraudulent deal.

This is a complete right-about turn. In making this about-face, they have betrayed not only their own correct stand and the interests of the Soviet people, but also all those who supported them.

It is recalled that the Soviet Government decided in August 1961 to resume nuclear tests to strengthen its national defence and counter the nuclear threat from U.S. imperialism. At that time, U.S. imperialism, other imperialist countries and the reactionaries of all countries went all out to attack the Soviet Union, creating a foul atmosphere for a time. In the interests of the entire socialist camp and the cause of world peace and irrespective of how rabid was the enemy and how violent the storm, the Chinese Government and people persevered in principle, stepped forward unhesitatingly to fulfil their proletarian internationalist duty and gave resolute support to the just action of the Soviet Government.

It is further recalled that when the Soviet Government in August 1962 justly rejected the draft treaty on partial stopping of nuclear tests put forward by the United States and Britain, the Chinese Government expressed unequivocal support for the position of the Soviet Government and pointed out that the U.S.-British draft treaty was in essence designed to promote the policy of nuclear blackmail and to step up preparations for a nuclear war. It also pointed out that in the circumstances when U.S. imperialism had no sincerity whatsoever for a ban on nuclear weapons, the socialist countries must reinforce their strength for self-defence and must not cherish any unrealistic illusions.

In fact, even up to early June this year after it had reached an agreement with the United States and Britain on the holding of nuclear test ban negotiations in Moscow, the Soviet Government formally notified the Chinese Government that the Western countries' position on the question of a nuclear test ban could not serve as the basis for reaching an agreement at present, and whether the talks could yield any result or not depended entirely on the Western side.

But soon afterwards, the Soviet Government completely forsook its original correct stand. This is what distresses the Chinese Government and Chinese people as well as all those who supported the correct stand of the Soviet Union.

Incontrovertible facts show that the Soviet Government has sold out the interests of the Soviet people, the interests of the peoples of the socialist camp including the Chinese people and the interests of the peace-loving people throughout the world. This is not "diplomacy marked by patience" but the diplomacy of capitulation pure and simple. This is not a victory of the policy of "peaceful coexistence" but a concentrated manifestation of capitulationism.

To cover up this capitulationist diplomacy, the Soviet paper *Izvestia* published a remarkable article arrogantly teaching

others: "One should open one's eyes to the yesterday and today of the world; it would be absurd even to equate 1962 with 1963." What does this mean? Does it mean that it was precisely in June-July 1963, no sooner or later, that the Soviet Government had all the reasons why it should capitulate to U.S. imperialism?

In its red-faced anger over the Chinese people's resolute exposure of the fraud produced by the Soviet leaders in partnership with U.S. imperialism, the *Izvestia* accused the Chinese people of taking an "absurd" position. This is strange indeed. We are now opposing the tripartite treaty from the same position which prompted us in the past to support the Soviet Union, and which was the position maintained by the Soviet Union itself in the past. It is the position taken by the Soviet leaders today which is truly absurd. What is more absurd is the fact that the *Izvestia* actually scurrilously abused the Chinese people as having ganged up with the "wild men" in the United States. No, the Chinese people have not had that "honour." It is not us, but you who embraced the U.S. imperialists in joyous abandon, that has ganged up with the "wild men" in the United States. He who claims to be the legitimate heir of Lenin now joins hands with the chieftain of imperialism. This is indeed "a curious company."

The Soviet leaders see only the U.S. imperialists. They believe that everything would be plain sailing if only the U.S. imperialists would give a nod and pat them on the shoulder. In their eyes, the other socialist countries and all other peace-loving countries are nothing. The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., Nikita S. Khrushchov, has publicly stated: "If peaceful, friendly relations were established between the United States and the U.S.S.R., it is doubtful whether anyone could complicate the international situation, as he would have to reckon with the position of our two countries." He has also more than once called for

"all-round co-operation" between the United States and the Soviet Union. This "all-round co-operation" appears to be what the Soviet leaders have been going all out to obtain from Camp David to Vienna, and from Vienna to Moscow. Now they have cooked up this treaty in Moscow with the United States and its partner — Britain, they want the more than 130 other countries to put their signatures to it. What is more, they have said that this is "a good start," which means that they intend to proceed along this path of U.S.-Soviet co-operation to dominate the world.

It is most obvious that the tripartite treaty is aimed at tying China's hands. The U.S. representative to the Moscow talks has said publicly that the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union were able to arrive at an agreement, because "we could work together to prevent China getting a nuclear capability." Recently, while fraternizing with U.S. imperialism on the most intimate terms, the Soviet leaders and the Soviet press have been gnashing their teeth in their bitter hatred towards socialist China. They use the same language as U.S. imperialism in abusing China. This is a U.S.-Soviet alliance against China pure and simple.

Inspired by Moscow, the West is giving publicity to the allegation that "a real 'redivision' of the world was taking place" (AFP). The U.S. propaganda machine has even declared: "If Khrushchov only turns a fish eye at China — which he is inclined to do anyway for purposes of his own — we might go far to accommodate him" (*New York Times*). And the *Chicago Sun Times* was even more outspoken when it called for "a reversal of alliances" by the Soviet Union and said that Washington "is offering a red carpet welcome for a returning Soviet prodigal." Obviously the red carpet is being unrolled to welcome the returning prodigal.

But the U.S. imperialists and their partners must not rejoice too soon. The Soviet Union is a great socialist state,

the Soviet people is a great people with a glorious revolutionary tradition, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is a great Party which was founded by Lenin himself and which has grown up in the course of struggle against opportunism of various stripes. Eventually, any deal which betrays the Soviet Union, betrays the Soviet people, and betrays the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will definitely end in failure.

WHY THE TRIPARTITE TREATY DOES ONLY HARM AND BRINGS NO BENEFIT

"Renmin Ribao," August 10, 1963

by Observer

The U.S. imperialists and their followers now have many thousands of nuclear bombs and are manufacturing more. These nuclear weapons are a constant threat to the people of all countries. With the sole exception of the U.S. imperialists and their followers who rely on nuclear weapons to intimidate and blackmail others and commit aggression, all the three thousand million people of the world are anxious for the complete, thorough, total and resolute prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons.

It was on August 5 that the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union formally signed the partial nuclear test ban treaty. The Soviet leaders described the treaty as a good beginning, weakening the forces of aggression and war. How nice! But what are the facts? The facts are that this treaty does only harm and brings no benefit.

1. THE CURRENT PARTIAL HALTING OF NUCLEAR TESTS IS NOT THE RESULT OF THIS TREATY

Some people think that since the U.S.-British-Soviet treaty provides for a halt to nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water, contamination from nuclear fallout in the air and water can be reduced a bit. This at any rate is

a good thing, they think, and, therefore, it is better to have than not to have this treaty.

Is this really so in fact? We feel that it is not.

It is completely understandable that the people of the various countries should want an end to nuclear tests, a reduction and even elimination of nuclear fallout contamination in the air and water.

But so far as the halting of nuclear tests is concerned, it must be pointed out that all responsibility for the failure to halt nuclear tests in the past rests with U.S. imperialism.

It was the United States which first manufactured and used the atomic bomb.

It is the United States which is frantically expanding its nuclear armaments, and which is trying its utmost to retain its nuclear monopoly and gain nuclear superiority.

For this purpose, it has been conducting an endless series of nuclear tests of various kinds. According to official U.S. figures, from July 1945 to last June, the United States conducted 259 nuclear tests. This means that most of the nuclear tests in the world have been conducted by the United States. It is precisely this frenzied U.S. policy of nuclear arms expansion and blackmail which has compelled the socialist countries to conduct the necessary tests, in order to safeguard their security and break the U.S. nuclear monopoly.

Furthermore, since most of the U.S. atmospheric and outer space nuclear tests have been conducted over the high seas, in the Pacific Ocean, they have gravely endangered the lives and health of the peoples of all countries in Asia and along the Pacific, particularly the Japanese people. The people throughout the world have long since demanded that the United States stop these nuclear tests, and their demand has built up into a pressure on a worldwide scale.

At the present time, nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water have in fact stopped. But this is by no means because of the signing of this treaty, but because the peoples of all countries are strongly opposed to nuclear

tests, and the countries possessing nuclear weapons, the United States in particular, have already acquired enough data from nuclear tests so that even a complete halt to nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water will not affect their continued mass production of nuclear weapons.

USIS also said on July 26: "By prohibiting testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, the treaty does not change the situation that now exists for the three great nuclear powers. None has conducted tests of this kind recently, and none has good reason for wanting to resume such testing in the foreseeable future."

On the other hand, what the United States needs now is more underground nuclear tests, and this treaty has actually legalized such tests. This is exactly what the United States wants. When the tripartite treaty was initialled, UPI reported that the U.S. military chiefs would support this treaty. "A persuasive factor with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, however, is that the agreement will leave America free to do about 80 per cent of the atomic testing deemed necessary, by resorting to underground explosions."

Commenting on the tripartite treaty, Allal Al Fassi, President of the Moroccan Istiqlal Party, pointedly said: "Since you have decided to preserve the infernal devices in your possession and since you have not undertaken any obligation not to explode them by testing them or to punish those who are not in agreement with you, what is the use of deceiving the people by such an agreement?" "If you ban testings in space and reserve complete freedom to carry on underground tests, what difference does this make between this or that way of destruction? It seems to me it is all the same whether lightning strikes us from the sky or from underground. They are all annihilating, incendiary bombs."

It is not as if the Soviet leaders did not understand this truth as pointed out by Fassi. Khrushchov once said: "If a decision were adopted to ban tests only in the atmosphere, this would shatter the peoples' hopes of a complete discon-

tinuance of tests." He also pointed out that this was a "deal" to "deceive the peoples." Now, the Soviet Government, in partnership with the imperialists, has made this deal to deceive the peoples. This shows that the Soviet leaders have openly capitulated to the imperialists.

2. THIS TREATY CAN IN NO WAY CONSTRAIN THE NUCLEAR POWERS, BUT ONLY BIND THE OTHER COUNTRIES HAND AND FOOT

Some people may say: Granting that it is not because of this treaty that no nuclear tests have recently been carried out in the atmosphere, outer space and under water, what is wrong with the treaty if it can constrain the nuclear powers and perpetuate the current suspension of these forms of nuclear testing?

This is not true. The treaty cannot constrain the signatory countries this way. It cannot ensure the perpetuation of the current state of affairs as mentioned above.

Article four of the treaty stipulates: "Each party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other parties to the treaty three months in advance."

This means that any nuclear power, chiefly the United States, can "exercise its national sovereignty" under the pretext of the occurrence of any "extraordinary events" and withdraw from the treaty at any time and resume nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water, without having to consult with other signatory countries and obtain their affirmation.

What a treaty this is!

According to normal international practice, any international treaty should have a certain and equal binding force

upon the signatory countries. However, the partial nuclear test ban treaty signed in Moscow has no binding force whatsoever on the nuclear powers. Any of them can make unilateral "decisions" and tear up the treaty. Therefore, this treaty is no treaty at all. Even U.S. General Lauris Norstad, former NATO Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, said: "It is something that can be violated by just unilateral decision. It's nothing you can enforce." No wonder as soon as the treaty was initialled U.S. President Kennedy made haste to announce: "We remain ready to withdraw and to resume all forms of testing, if we must."

It is well known that this treaty is a refurbished version of the draft treaty proposed by the United States and Britain on August 27, 1962. The only difference is that the signatory countries to this treaty can withdraw from it freely without having to hold any meeting. Therefore, it is all the more devoid of binding force on the three nuclear powers, the United States in particular, than the U.S.-British draft.

What is even more absurd is that though the treaty has no binding force on the three nuclear powers, they are using it to inveigle other countries into signing it and make them undertake unconditionally the obligation not to conduct any nuclear weapon tests. According to the stipulations of this treaty, the three nuclear powers may continue underground nuclear tests while the non-nuclear countries cannot conduct any nuclear test. For, as everyone knows, the testing of nuclear weapons must begin with tests in the atmosphere. Without the data accumulated through this kind of tests it would be impossible to manufacture any nuclear weapons at all, not to speak of conducting underground tests for the improvement of such weapons.

Furthermore, it is obligatory that all other countries acceding to the treaty abide by it while enjoying no right to make amendments. The tripartite treaty stipulates explicitly that "any amendment to this treaty must be approved by a majority of the votes of all the parties to this treaty, including

the votes of all of the original parties." In other words, the treaty assures the three nuclear powers an inviolable right of veto. The accession of even a hundred countries to the treaty would therefore not change its character in the least.

What is more, but for this treaty, nuclear powers like the United States, in face of the increasingly strong pressure of the people of the various countries against nuclear tests, would have to think twice before they resume such tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water. Now, with the conclusion of this treaty, they can easily find a pretext to legalize their resumption of such nuclear tests.

Commenting on the question of Japan's accession to the treaty, the Japanese bourgeois paper *Mainichi Shimbun* said that "this can only bring about the consequence of recognizing the monopoly of the three powers not only in nuclear weapons but in diplomacy based on nuclear armaments" and that this was tantamount to "disregarding" the "principle of sovereignty and equality." The Pakistan paper *Hurriyat* (*Freedom*) in an editorial rightly said: "Though the Soviet Union is a socialist country it is strange that it has united with the Western imperialists."

What is this line of action followed by the Soviet leaders if not capitulation to imperialism?

3. THE TREATY BENEFITS U.S. IMPERIALISM IN ITS DRIVE FOR NUCLEAR SUPREMACY AND INCREASES THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR

Some people argue: Granting that the treaty cannot constrain its signatories, things will at most be the same as if there were no such treaty at all, so how can it be said that it is worse to have than not to have this treaty?

Yes. We declare that it is indeed worse, and far worse, to have than not to have this treaty and we are not exaggerating at all, since:

Firstly, this treaty tends to mislead the people of the various countries, paralyse their spirit and disorganize their struggles.

The peace-loving people throughout the world have all the time been maintaining a heightened vigilance against the U.S. imperialist policies of the nuclear arms drive, nuclear war preparations and nuclear blackmail and have risen in ever-growing numbers to fight against the threat of nuclear war and for a total ban on nuclear weapons. Now that the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union have cooked up this fraudulent treaty and that there are people who have lauded it to the skies, asserting that it was "a turning-point in history" and that it "had blazed a path towards completely freeing mankind from atomic and hydrogen calamities," and so on and so forth, an illusion has been created in the world that the few nuclear powers have taken steps capable of eliminating the threat of nuclear war, that they have done something beneficial to world peace and that the people of the world can rest in peace.

As the Burmese paper *Ludu* has pointed out, the tripartite treaty may create an illusion among the people that U.S. imperialism loves peace and so it can be a great political gain for the U.S. imperialists.

All this, of course, is favourable only to the U.S. imperialist policies of nuclear arms expansion and nuclear war preparations and unfavourable to the struggle of the people of the world against the threat of nuclear war and for a total ban on nuclear weapons. As a result, the danger of nuclear war, far from lessening, will increase immensely.

It is not as if the Soviet leaders had not perceived this in the past. In a statement in connection with the joint statement of the U.S.-British heads of government on nuclear weapon tests, Khrushchov pointed out on September 9, 1961: "Agreement on the cessation of one kind of tests only — in the atmosphere — would be a disservice to the cause of peace. It would mean deceiving the peoples. Such agreement could create the harmful and dangerous illusion among the peoples

that steps were being taken to put an end to the arms race, while in fact nothing of the kind would have been done." But now they have joined hands with U.S. imperialism in spreading such a harmful and dangerous illusion and their voice has been louder than that of U.S. imperialism. This is truly a "disservice to the cause of peace."

Secondly, it is all the more necessary to point out that this treaty legalizes underground nuclear tests by the U.S., thus gravely jeopardizing world peace.

The Kennedy government, being well aware that by launching a major nuclear war it will bring serious consequences upon itself, is laying the stress of U.S. military strategy on preparations for limited nuclear wars. Present U.S. policy in nuclear war preparations is to develop tactical nuclear weapons energetically while continuing to improve strategic nuclear weapons. The United States is devoting special attention to the establishment of its tactical nuclear force in preparation for waging "limited nuclear wars" against the socialist countries, and particularly against the national independence movement of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples. In view of the fact that the most up-to-date conventional weapons and even the inhuman bacteriological and chemical weapons used by the United States in Korea and south Viet Nam have failed to bring victory, the United States is anxious to resort to tactical nuclear weapons to save itself from defeat.

These assumptions and preparations of the United States serve its "strategy of flexible response." This was made fairly clear long ago by Maxwell Taylor, Kennedy's Military Adviser and the Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, in his book *The Uncertain Trumpet.* After analysing the disadvantageous position of the United States in its relative conventional military strength and nuclear military strength, he proposed the formulation of a new state military plan which would include:

1. Renouncing reliance on the strategy of massive retaliation and declaring that "the United States will prepare itself to respond anywhere, any time, with weapons and forces appropriate to the situation."
2. Accepting "the limitations of our atomic retaliatory forces" and using them only in case of "an atomic attack on the continental United States or the discovery of indisputable evidence that such an attack was about to take place," and "a major attack upon Europe."
3. Revision of the definition of general war and limited war. The term general war "will designate a conflict in which the forces of the United States and the U.S.S.R. are directly involved and in which atomic weapons are assumed to be used from the outset." Limited war "will be considered to be a conflict short of general war in which the United States forces will use atomic weapons as required to achieve national objectives."

He wrote: "With regard to atomic weapons, it would provide our forces with small tactical atomic weapons. . . . In the design of tactical atomic weapons, emphasis should be placed upon developing those of very low yield, which offer no hazards of fallout or serious danger to friendly troops and allied populations."

The existing U.S. policy of nuclear armament was worked out precisely in accordance with these strategic ideas. This was what Kennedy meant when he declared after the initialling of the tripartite treaty that "the United States has deliberately chosen to concentrate on more mobile and more efficient weapons, with lower but entirely sufficient yield." The United States needs to and can depend on underground nuclear tests both to continue to improve its strategic nuclear weapons and to develop vigorously its tactical nuclear weapons. John MacCone, former Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, stated that "[nuclear] weapons, large and small, can be developed and improved by testing underground."

The United States needs continued underground nuclear tests and the tripartite treaty legalizes the continuation by the United States of precisely such tests. It gives it a free hand in conducting the nuclear armament drive under cover of this treaty without being condemned by world public opinion.

Thirdly, this treaty helps the imperialist countries but shackles the socialist countries and all oppressed countries.

This treaty can neither hamper the United States from spreading its nuclear bases, nuclear equipment, nuclear submarines and aircraft carrying nuclear bombs to many parts of the world, nor can it prevent the United States from supplying nuclear weapons and technical data for their manufacture to the countries under U.S. control. Kennedy indicated at a press conference held on August 1 that in spite of the tripartite treaty U.S. nuclear weapons could still be sold to its allies and that the United States was willing to provide nuclear aid to France. Harriman also stated on July 31 that the treaty had no provisions whatsoever which hindered the United States from providing its allies with nuclear secrets.

What deserves attention is that the Kennedy Administration is stepping up its plan for a "multilateral nuclear force." This is, in essence, a plan to spread nuclear arms within the Western camp. It will enable more Western countries to acquire nuclear weapons and strengthen the nuclear force of the entire imperialist camp. The conference on establishing a "multilateral nuclear force" resumed its work in Washington immediately after the signing of the tripartite treaty. The West German news agency DPA disclosed that the United States was engaged in intense diplomatic activity in an effort to drag more countries into the talks. Kennedy has publicly confirmed the U.S. intention to give a number of "nuclear secrets" to France in exchange for the latter's support for the tripartite treaty. All existing signs indicate that the United States is vigorously preparing to spread nuclear weapons to its allies. What it is striving for is simply to place these

countries under its direct control before spreading nuclear arms to them.

On the other hand, the treaty is aimed at binding the hands of all socialist countries, except the Soviet Union, and of all countries being oppressed by the United States, rendering it impossible for them to strengthen their defence capability against the nuclear threat of U.S. imperialism. But the Soviet Government actually regards this treaty as a step in preventing the spread of nuclear arms. While raising no objection whatever to the activity of the United States to spread nuclear arms among its allies, it does its utmost to prevent the other socialist countries and all oppressed countries from acquiring nuclear weapons. This can only result in facilitating the efforts of the imperialist camp headed by the United States to attain nuclear supremacy.

The Indonesian paper *Bintang Timur* has correctly described the treaty as being favourable to imperialism and unfavourable to the people of the world. It said that the treaty "means handing a pass to imperialism, enabling it to continue its policy of nuclear blackmail."

The Soviet Government is servilely meeting the needs of U.S. imperialism, helping the United States to consolidate its position of nuclear monopoly, strengthening the imperialist camp and weakening the socialist camp and all oppressed countries. What is it actually doing if not perpetrating out-and-out betrayal and capitulation?

4. THE TREATY IS NOT A FIRST STEP TOWARDS PEACE BUT A STEP TO INCREASE THE DANGER OF WAR

Some people have admitted that the partial nuclear test ban treaty cannot eliminate the threat of nuclear war, but, they argue, it is nevertheless a step towards the total prohibition of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war. They ask: Since a total ban on nuclear weapons cannot be realized at once, why should one object to the taking of a first step?

The Chinese Government has always called for the achievement, step by step, of the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. In its statement on July 31, it proposed, among other things, four feasible measures which should be adopted first.

But what is the tripartite treaty like?

As was repeatedly pointed out by the Soviet Government before, the discontinuance of nuclear tests will have meaning only if it is a part of a whole disarmament programme and is one of the measures for a total ban on nuclear weapons. The tripartite treaty, however, divorces the discontinuance of nuclear tests completely from the prohibition of nuclear weapons and makes no mention whatsoever of the banning of nuclear weapons. By legalizing underground tests, it relegates far into the background even a total ban on nuclear tests.

At the signing ceremony of the tripartite treaty in Moscow, U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk said: "The treaty we have signed today is a good first step — a step for which the United States has long and devoutly hoped. . . . It does not end the threat of nuclear war. It does not reduce nuclear stockpiles. It does not halt the production of nuclear weapons. It does not restrict their use in time of war." He added: "It is therefore not yet possible for us to guarantee now what the significance of this act will be." Those who try to gloss over their capitulation are taking pains to present the treaty as one of historic significance. But apparently Rusk was more interested in enumerating its benefits to the United States than in leaving a shred of cover to the capitulationists and traitors.

It may be recalled that when the Soviet Union agreed last year to consider discontinuance of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water, it still stuck to its position that no underground nuclear tests should be conducted pending an agreement on their control. But now the tripartite treaty gives a free hand to the nuclear powers to

conduct underground nuclear tests. This being the case, does not the treaty serve precisely as an obstacle standing in the way of realization of the complete prohibition of nuclear tests?

Immediately after the initialling of the tripartite treaty, Kennedy openly declared that the United States would continue to conduct underground tests. W. C. Foster, Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, also said plainly that it was not likely to ban underground tests at an early date. Since even such a step as the banning of underground tests is something very remote, how can the tripartite partial nuclear test ban treaty be counted as a first step?

Far from being a first step towards a total ban on nuclear weapons and towards general disarmament, the tripartite treaty has made the realization of these urgent tasks even more difficult.

If the Soviet Government had adhered to the correct stand which it had adopted previously on the prohibition of nuclear weapons and the reduction of armaments and mobilized the people of the world to struggle for the realization of this aim, the greater would have been the possibility of forcing the United States and its followers to undertake concrete commitments. In fact, the struggle of the people of various countries for the establishment of nuclear weapon-free zones and for the dismantling of foreign military bases, including nuclear bases, has been mounting in recent years, and the United States is finding itself in a serious fix. But now the Soviet Union has concluded with the United States and Britain this fraudulent treaty which they call the partial nuclear test ban treaty, and is declaring that at present the demands for the establishment of nuclear weapon-free zones and the removal of foreign military bases are both unrealistic so it is asking the people of all lands to place their hopes for the prevention of nuclear war on the reaching of agreement "step by step" among the three nuclear powers. Is it not true that this has pushed aside the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons and other pressing tasks? Is it not true that this

has placed more obstacles in the way of the achievement of a total ban on nuclear weapons and of general disarmament?

Radio Ghana pointed out in a commentary on August 3 that in the space of barely one week after the tripartite treaty was initialled, "the elation of the peace-loving world is turning into doubt and even dejection." It said: "The first cause of concern is the growing realization that underground tests, which are not covered by the test ban treaty, enable scientists to conduct research into practically every field of nuclear armament. The second cause of concern is the painful realization that the Moscow treaty has left the vital problem of destroying the stocks of nuclear weapons completely unsolved." The commentary has thus rightly pointed out that "the loopholes of the Moscow treaty would bring the world nearer nuclear war."

Obviously, the tripartite treaty, viewed from any angle, is absolutely not a first step towards peace, as alleged, but rather a serious step to increase the war danger and a serious step on the part of the Soviet leaders in open capitulation to imperialism.

What warrants attention is that a further political deal is in the making. The people of the world must maintain a heightened vigilance towards this.

The tripartite treaty is a fraud and a very dangerous one at that. It is an urgent task of the struggle of all peace-loving countries and peoples of the world at this present time to expose this fraud, smash it and forestall any new ones, and to hold higher the banner for a total ban on and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, and the banner of opposing imperialism and defending world peace.

FURTHER EXPOSURE OF SOVIET LEADERS' ACTS OF BETRAYAL

"Renmin Ribao" Editorial, August 30, 1963

After the West German militarists had gleefully joined the tripartite U.S.-British-Soviet treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests, the Chiang Kai-shek clique in Taiwan, a clique held in contempt by the people throughout the world, affixed its name to the same "sacred" treaty. There are, indeed, jugglers and jugglers and each has his different tricks. The creators of the Moscow treaty look like conjurers on the stage. With one turn of the hand, they transformed two Germanys into "one Germany" and, with another turn, produce "two Chinas" out of one.

Together with the leaders of the Soviet Union, the Chiang Kai-shek gang signed the Moscow treaty in the manner of a participant with full powers. This is another iron-clad proof that in order to meet the needs of the "two Chinas" scheme engineered by U.S. imperialism, the Soviet leaders do not hesitate to betray their ally and the interests of the socialist camp and of the world's people.

One can readily imagine: had the Chinese Government failed to see in time through the fraud of the Moscow treaty and to maintain the necessary vigilance against the Soviet leaders' betrayal; had the Chinese Government instead wrongly believed in the deceptive talk about the great advantages of the treaty for the destiny of mankind and signed it; then the Chinese Government would have fallen into the "two Chinas" trap, bringing untold humiliation to the great Chinese people.

It is well known that the U.S. imperialists are trying by every means to engineer a "two Chinas" scheme. This is not surprising. On this occasion, however, the "two Chinas" trap was set with the gleeful consent of the Soviet leaders, who boastfully call themselves the protectors of China. This was generally unexpected. However, Western press reports have long shed light on this foul political deal concluded in Moscow. Reporting from Washington on July 31, the West German news agency, Deutsche Presse Agentur, revealed that "a procedure" had been "agreed upon" by the Soviet leaders and U.S. imperialism: the Government of Democratic Germany would send its entry documents to the Soviet Union and the Chiang Kai-shek clique in Taiwan would send its instruments of ratification to the United States. Washington's open reference to this foul bargain has never been denied by the Soviet Government. Being fully aware of all this, the Soviet Government has the audacity to demand, or pretend to hope, that China sign the treaty. Had China complied, would she not have been placed in a similar position to that of the German Democratic Republic, with the Chiang Kai-shek clique as a participant with both obligations and rights, while she had to satisfy herself with being a participant with only the obligations but not the rights? The 650 million Chinese people cannot but feel shocked and angered that the Soviet Union, an ally of China, should have supposed that China should and could play such a humiliating role.

Ever since the founding of the People's Republic of China and U.S. imperialism's forcible occupation of the Chinese territory of Taiwan, the Soviet Government has on public occasions, including in the United Nations, expressed its support for the just demand of the Chinese people for the liberation of their own sacred territory of Taiwan and has repeatedly made clear its opposition to the "two Chinas" scheme engineered by U.S. imperialism. At various meetings and conferences of the United Nations, leaders of the Soviet Union and representatives of the Soviet Government have rightly maintained that

Taiwan is an inalienable part of the Chinese territory and that only one China exists in the world and not two. N. S. Khrushchov himself once said that the Chiang Kai-shek gang was but "a political corpse" and that attempts to revive such a political corpse "merely poison the international atmosphere." However, the Soviet leaders have now betrayed this correct position upheld by the Soviet people, and have collaborated with U.S. imperialism in digging up the political corpse of the Chiang Kai-shek gang and in trying to summon back its spirit at the altar of the Moscow treaty. This is betrayal of the Chinese people and also of the Soviet people who are persisting in an internationalist position.

It must be pointed out too that the current "two Chinas" scheme, jointly planned in Moscow by the Soviet leaders and U.S. imperialism, is also a deception and insult to all the participants to the treaty that are friendly to China and opposed to "two Chinas." The Soviet leaders and U.S. imperialism are attempting to force these nations to accept "two Chinas" as an accomplished fact.

Now it is clear to all that the Soviet leaders are making use of the trap of the Moscow treaty to oppose socialist China. Whatever ostrich-like methods they may continue to resort to in their defence, the Soviet leaders cannot possibly cover up their betrayal of the interests of the Chinese people and the Soviet people.

The Soviet leaders have charged China with standing together with the West German militarists. The fact is now very clear that it is not we but the Soviet leaders who are standing at the side of the West German militarists, Adenauer and the like, and that again it is not we but the Soviet leaders who have betrayed the interests of the people of the German Democratic Republic.

While it has obviously recognized the West German regime in fact as the sole legal representative of Germany, the Soviet Government hypocritically sent a note to the Governments of the United States and Britain, complaining that the two

imperialist governments had not accepted the signature of Democratic Germany. The complaint has, however, no actual value whatsoever. It can neither make the U.S. imperialists change their mind and recognize the German Democratic Republic as a "participant with full powers" in the tripartite treaty, nor can it alter the position of the West German regime as a "participant with full powers" in the tripartite treaty. By no means can the Soviet Government wash away the humiliation it has imposed on the German people.

Having sacrificed the interests of the German people in exchange for the signature of the Bonn authorities on the tripartite treaty, the Soviet leaders had the effrontery to say that under the pressure of world public opinion the West German regime was "beginning to reform their ranks" and forced to sign the tripartite treaty. It is known by all who respect facts that the Adenauer group has never expressed any objection to the essence of the tripartite treaty. The only reason why they once made reservations about the treaty was their attempt to gain further advantages from it. The Bonn regime signed the Moscow treaty immediately after Rusk, U.S. Secretary of State, and R. S. McNamara, U.S. Secretary of Defence, went to Bonn one after another and personally gave Adenauer assurances guaranteeing the interests of West Germany, including firm pledges that the United States would not recognize the German Democratic Republic, not betray West Germany in agreeing to sign any mutual non-aggression treaty, not give up the "multilateral nuclear force" plan which will help West Germany to get possession of nuclear weapons, and so on and so forth. From the arrogant statement made by the West German regime after signing the tripartite treaty, one can see how satisfied and overjoyed the Adenauer group is at being able to raise their price through their participation in the Moscow treaty. But the Soviet leaders and their followers have gone so far as to allege, in an attempt to camouflage their act of betrayal, that this is a forced "retreat" on the part

of the West German regime. They have indeed lost all sense of shame.

We pointed out long ago that the Moscow treaty cooked up by the Soviet leaders in partnership with the U.S. imperialists was utter betrayal by the Soviet leaders of the interests of the people of the world. All the things they have actually sold to U.S. imperialism are now coming to light one after another.

In order to set the trap of the Moscow treaty and in order to do a deal with U.S. imperialism to get a straw to clutch at in their attempt to show the success of their general line of foreign policy, the Soviet leaders have unscrupulously betrayed the interests of the people of the countries of the socialist camp and the world on a series of major issues. The betrayal of the interests of the Chinese people over the question of Taiwan, and the betrayal of those of the German people over the question of the international status of the G.D.R. are naked exposures of the line of capitulation to imperialism by the Soviet leaders.

From all this there is only one conclusion: in order to carry on their general line of capitulation, and to beg U.S. imperialism for peace, the Soviet leaders will stop at no deals of betrayal.

Taiwan is a part of Chinese territory, and the Chinese people are determined to liberate it. The Chiang Kai-shek clique on Taiwan is a political corpse supported by the bayonets of the U.S. imperialists, and any scheme to create "two Chinas" is doomed to humiliating bankruptcy. If anybody, or any political force, has degenerated to the extent of attempting to make use of a political corpse like the Chiang Kai-shek clique in order to oppose China and to demonstrate his "great victory," it is he, a pitiable creature trying to summon back the spirit of a political corpse, who will come to grief, and definitely not the Chinese people standing firm and unyielding in the world.

We would like to tell the nuclear overlords that the destiny of the world today can be manipulated at will neither by the U.S. imperialists nor by the Soviet leaders. That the Soviet leaders want to sell out the interests of the Chinese people is one thing, and whether or not the interests of the Chinese people can be sold out is another. China's destiny is securely held in the hands of the Chinese people. Six hundred and fifty million people who have risen to their feet will certainly be able to smash any attempt by the U.S. imperialists and the Soviet leaders to force them to yield by a policy of nuclear blackmail.

APPENDICES

HSINHUA* EDITOR'S NOTE

July 29, 1963

The United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union initialled a partial nuclear test ban treaty in Moscow on July 25. We have released today the full text of the treaty, together with excerpts from U.S. President John F. Kennedy's remarks of July 26, the interview of N.S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., with reporters of the Soviet newspapers, *Pravda* and *Izvestia*, and reactions from various quarters.**

In an all-out effort to boost the treaty after it was initialled, certain persons described it as "of great international importance," "a victory for the world forces of peace," "a great triumph for the policy of peaceful coexistence," "herald of peace," "a turning-point in the history of mankind," and so on and so forth.

Now how should one evaluate this treaty?

In his remarks of July 26, U.S. President Kennedy publicly stated the views of the United States. He pointed out: 1. The treaty will not "eliminate the

---

* Hsinhua, the official news agency of the People's Republic of China.

** Khrushchov's interview with *Pravda* and *Izvestia* reporters, and the reactions from various quarters were printed in the July 29, 1963 issue of *Renmin Ribao*.

danger of war," "nor does this treaty mean an end to the threat of nuclear war." 2. It will not affect the U.S. strength of nuclear weapons of "entirely sufficient yield." 3. It permits, and does not prohibit, the United States to continue its underground nuclear testing. 4. It does not restrict continued production and stockpiling of nuclear weapons by the United States. 5. It does not restrict the use of nuclear weapons by the United States in time of war. 6. It does not restrict U.S. "assistance" to other nations. In addition, Kennedy said that the United States would benefit from the treaty in that it could prevent those countries not now possessing nuclear arms from possessing them. He further declared that the United States remained "ready to withdraw (from the treaty) and to resume all forms of testing, if we must."

Thus, Kennedy has completely laid bare the substance of this treaty — that it cannot restrict the United States, whereas it can restrict others, it can restrict those other socialist countries not now possessing nuclear weapons, and it can restrain the socialist countries' efforts to strengthen their national defence. So it helps the United States in enhancing its monopoly of nuclear weapons and the building up of its nuclear superiority so as to enable it to continue threatening the socialist countries and the peoples of the world and to carry on its nuclear blackmail.

However, the leaders and press of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, the French Communist Party and the Italian Communist Party went so far as to laud this treaty to

the skies, calling it something of a prodigy. Is this not deceiving oneself and others?

As a matter of fact, the ruling classes in Japan, France and Britain have a clear idea about the treaty. Their press has shown reservations towards it.

The *Nippon Keizai Shimbun* (the *Japan Economic News*) said: "Standing on a much higher plane than the ending of nuclear tests, Japan is maintaining its position on the question of nuclear weapons, and there is no need for her to join the nuclear test ban treaty."

The French paper *Le Monde* said that the tripartite agreement was of little significance. The treaty, it added, "does not make the signatories promise much" in view of the fact that "they keep without any control stocks of (nuclear) weapons sufficient for destroying the planet many times" and that "they are able to increase their stocks at will."

Commenting on the initialling of the treaty, the British journal *Economist* referred to "some people's inclination to think that the end of the cold war may be in sight," and said, "nothing of the sort is in prospect."

The enlightened opinion in Asian and African countries went further to stress the need to remain vigilant with regard to the treaty. The *Ghanaian Times* pointed out that "the ultimate objective of the peoples of the world is to secure a ban on all nuclear weapons, their manufacture, testing and stockpiling. It is only on such a condition that the threat of a nuclear conflagration can be completely removed and peace thus safeguarded."

Another aspect of the matter also warrants attention. Following the initialling of the treaty, the head of the U.S. delegation, Averell Harriman, said at his press conference at the U.S. embassy in Moscow that the United States, Britain and the U.S.S.R. were able to reach an agreement on a partial nuclear test ban treaty, because Premier Khrushchov "very much wanted one at this time." And the noted American columnist, Walter Lippmann, pointed out that the treaty initialled by the U.S., Britain and the U.S.S.R. "is, it appears, substantially the same treaty as we offered the Soviet Union nearly a year ago on August 27, 1962." The same point was made by Kennedy in his remarks referred to above. But a year ago, the Soviet Government was opposed to that draft treaty.

To help the readers grasp the substance of the partial nuclear test ban treaty recently initialled by the U.S., Britain and the U.S.S.R., we now release the text of the draft treaty put forward by the United States and Britain on August 27, 1962 together with the comments on the draft treaty made by V. V. Kuznetsov, then head of the Soviet delegation.

TREATY BANNING NUCLEAR WEAPON TESTS IN THE ATMOSPHERE, IN OUTER SPACE AND UNDER WATER CONCLUDED BY THE UNITED STATES, BRITAIN AND THE SOVIET UNION
(Full Text)

TITLE

Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water

PREAMBLE

The Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, hereinafter referred to as the "Original Parties,"

Proclaiming as their principal aim the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations which would put an end to the armaments race and eliminate the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons,

Seeking to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time, determined to continue negotiations to this end, and desiring to put an end to the contamination of man's environment by radioactive substances,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

1. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control:

A. In the atmosphere, beyond its limits, including outer space, or under water, including territorial waters or high seas; or

B. In any other environment if such explosion causes radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the state under whose jurisdiction or control such explosion is conducted. It is understood in this connection that the provisions of this subparagraph are without prejudice to the conclusion of a treaty resulting in the permanent banning of all nuclear test explosions, including all such explosions underground, the conclusions of which, as the Parties have stated in the Preamble to this Treaty, they seek to achieve.

2. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article.

ARTICLE II

1. Any Party may propose amendments to this Treaty. The text of any proposed amendment shall be submitted to the Depositary Governments which shall circulate it to all Parties to this Treaty. Thereafter, if requested to do so by one-third or more of the Parties, the Depositary Governments shall convene a conference, to which they shall invite all the Parties, to consider such amendment.

2. Any amendment to this Treaty must be approved by a majority of the votes of all the Parties to this Treaty, including the votes of all of the Original Parties. The amendment shall enter into force for all Parties upon the deposit of instruments of ratification by a majority of all the Parties, including the instruments of ratification of all of the Original Parties.

ARTICLE III

1. This Treaty shall be open to all states for signature. Any state which does not sign this Treaty before its entry into force in accordance with paragraph 3 of this Article may accede to it at any time.

2. This Treaty shall be subject to ratification by signatory states. Instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Governments of the Original Parties — the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics — which are hereby designated the Depositary Governments.

3. This Treaty shall enter into force after its ratification by all the Original Parties and the deposit of their instruments of ratification.

4. For states whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited subsequent to the entry into force of this Treaty, it shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession.

5. The Depositary Governments shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding states of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each instrument of ratification of and accession to this Treaty, the date of its entry into force, and the date of receipt of any requests for conferences or other notices.

6. This Treaty shall be registered by the Depositary Governments pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

ARTICLE IV

This Treaty shall be of unlimited duration.

Each Party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this Treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other Parties to the Treaty three months in advance.

ARTICLE V

This Treaty, of which the English and Russian texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Depositary Governments. Duly certified copies of this Treaty shall be transmitted by the Depositary Governments to the Governments of the signatory and acceding states.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Treaty.

Done in triplicate at Moscow, this 25th day of July, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty-three.

DRAFT TREATY BANNING NUCLEAR TESTS IN THE ATMOSPHERE, OUTER SPACE AND UNDER WATER PROPOSED BY THE UNITED STATES AND BRITAIN AT THE AUGUST 27, 1962 SESSION OF THE DISARMAMENT COMMITTEE IN GENEVA (Full Text)

Draft Treaty Banning Nuclear Tests in the Atmosphere, Outer Space and Under Water

PREAMBLE

The Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, hereinafter referred to as the Original Parties,

Desirous of bringing about the permanent discontinuance of all nuclear weapon test explosions and determine to continue negotiations to this end,

Confident that immediate discontinuance of nuclear weapon test explosions in the atmosphere, in outer space, and in the oceans will facilitate progress toward the early agreement providing for the permanent and verified discontinuance of nuclear weapon test explosions in all environments,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

OBLIGATIONS

1. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes to prohibit and prevent the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion at any place under its jurisdiction and control:

A. In the atmosphere, above the atmosphere, or in territorial or high seas; or

B. In any other environment if such explosion causes radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the state under whose jurisdiction or control such explosion is conducted.

2. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect proscribed, in paragraph 1 of this Article.

ARTICLE II

EXPLOSIONS FOR PEACEFUL PURPOSES

The explosion of any nuclear device for peaceful purposes which would take place in any of the environments described, or would have the effect proscribed, in paragraph 1 of Article I may be conducted only: (1) if unanimously agreed to by the Original Parties; or (2) if carried out in accordance with an annex hereto [no annex was attached to the text transmitted by USIS], which annex shall constitute an integral part of this Treaty.

ARTICLE III

WITHDRAWAL

1. If any Party to this Treaty determines

A. That any other Party has not fulfilled its obligations under this Treaty,

B. That nuclear explosions have been conducted by a state not a Party to this Treaty under circumstances which might jeopardize the Determining Party's national security, or

C. That nuclear explosions have occurred under circumstances in which it is not possible to identify the state

conducting the explosions and that such explosions, if conducted by a Party to this Treaty, would violate the Treaty, or, if not conducted by a Party, might jeopardize the Determining Party's national security, it may submit to the Depositary Government a request for the convening of a conference to which all the Parties to this Treaty shall be invited, and the Depositary Government shall convene such a conference as soon after its receipt of the request as may be practicable. The request for the Determining Party to the Depositary Government shall be accompanied by a statement of the evidence on which the determination was based.

2. The conference shall, taking into account the statement of evidence provided by the Determining Party and any other relevant information, examine the facts and assess the significance of the situation.

3. After the conclusion of the conference or after the expiration of a period of 60 days from the date of the receipt of the request for the conference by the Depositary Government, whichever is the earlier, any Party to this Treaty may, if it deems withdrawal from the Treaty necessary for its national security, give notice of such withdrawal to the Depositary Government. Such withdrawal shall take effect on the date specified in the notice, which shall in no event be earlier than 60 days from receipt of the notice of the Depositary Government. The notice shall be accompanied by a detailed statement of the reasons for the withdrawal.

ARTICLE IV

AMENDMENTS

1. Any Party may propose amendments to this Treaty. The text of any proposed amendments shall be submitted to the Depositary Government which shall circulate it to all Parties. Thereafter, if requested to do so by one-third or more of the Parties, the Depositary Government shall convene a

conference, to which it shall invite all Parties, to consider such amendment.

2. Any amendment to this Treaty or its annex must be approved by a vote of two-thirds of the Parties, including all of the "Original Parties." It shall enter into force for all Parties upon the deposit of ratifications by two-thirds of the Parties to this Treaty, including ratification by the Original Parties.

ARTICLE V

SIGNATURE, RATIFICATION, ACCESSION, ENTRY INTO FORCE AND REGISTRATION

1. This Treaty shall be open until . . . . . to all states for signature. Any state which does not sign this Treaty may accede to it at any time.

2. This Treaty shall be subject to ratification by signatory states. Instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Government of . . . . . , which is hereby designated the Depositary Government.

3. This Treaty shall enter into force on . . . . . for states which have deposited instruments of ratification or accession on or before that date, provided that the ratifications deposited include those of the Original Parties. If ratifications by all three Original Parties are not deposited on or before . . . . . , this Treaty shall enter into force on the date on which ratifications by all of them have been deposited.

4. Instruments of ratification or accession deposited subsequent to the entry into force of this Treaty shall become binding on the date of deposit.

5. The Depositary Government shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding states of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each ratification of and accession to this Treaty, the date of its entry into force, and the date of receipt of any requests for conferences or notices of withdrawals.

6. This Treaty shall be registered by the Depositary Government pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

ARTICLE VI

AUTHENTIC TEXTS

This Treaty, of which the English and Russian texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Depositary Government. Duly certified copies of this Treaty shall be transmitted by the Depositary Government to the Governments of the signatory and acceding states.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Treaty.

Done at . . . . . , this . . . . . day of . . . . . , One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty-two.

STATEMENT BY V. V. KUZNETSOV, HEAD OF THE SOVIET DELEGATION, AT A MEETING OF THE DISARMAMENT COMMITTEE HELD IN GENEVA ON AUGUST 29, 1962

The Tass News Agency reported the statement made by V.V. Kuznetsov, head of the delegation of the U.S.S.R. to the Disarmament Committee, at a meeting of the 18-nation Disarmament Committee held in Geneva on August 29, 1962. The statement set forth the views of the Soviet Union on the two draft treaties concerning a total and a partial ban on tests of nuclear weapons, which were advanced on August 27, 1962 by the delegations of Britain and the United States.

As reported by Tass, V. V. Kuznetsov analysed the position which the United States has taken on the question of ending nuclear weapon tests for as many years as negotiations continue, and pointed out that essentially this position has remained and remains unchanged. The essence of this position is that the U.S.A. is constantly putting forward one and the same demand: either that there will be no end to tests and the nuclear arms race will continue mounting, or that the Soviet Union, as a price for the discontinuance of tests, must open before the Western powers, before the NATO war bloc, its system of national defence in conditions when definite Western quarters make no bones of the fact that they are preparing a nuclear war against the peace-loving states.

This goal underlay the proposals of the Western powers, made on April 18, 1961, and it has not changed subsequently, Kuznetsov stressed.

The Soviet delegate likened this position to the behaviour of an ugly old spinster, who primps herself every year for

prospective suitors, but despite her fashionable dress and heavy make-up, remains as ugly as ever and is getting older each year.

V.V. Kuznetsov recalled the manoeuvres of the U.S.A. since the submission of their memorandum by the eight neutral states. The United States realized then that it could only compromise itself if it continued to insist on its proposals in their original form. It was then that the United States declared its acceptance of the 8-nation memorandum as "one of the bases for negotiation."

The United States came out with so-called "new" proposals on August 6, 1962, but it didn't take much time to be convinced that these "new" proposals were no more than a refurbished version of its old position.

V.V. Kuznetsov declared that now we are again told that the new U.S.-British proposals of August 27 are practically a concrete expression in treaty form of the provisions contained in the 8-nation memorandum. However, mandatory on-site inspection remains an inseparable part of this new Anglo-American project. Therefore, on the question of inspection, the United States and Britain have not met half-way the memorandum of the neutralist nations, have not agreed to accept one of the basic propositions of this memorandum, precisely the point that on-site verification can be carried out only at the invitation of the state in whose territory the undistinguished and considerable event had taken place.

The United States and Britain did not accept the important proposition of the 8-nation memorandum to the effect that supervision over the fulfilment of commitments not to hold nuclear tests should be carried out by the already available national stations for the detection of nuclear blasts.

Referring to the second draft advanced by the United States and Britain — Draft Treaty Banning Nuclear Tests in the Atmosphere, Outer Space and Under Water, Kuznetsov noted the groundlessness of A. Dean's contentions that the treaty, which will ban nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, outer

space and under water, but will not hinder the continuation of underground nuclear tests, "will nevertheless be a definite check on the arms race." The Soviet delegate pointed out that the continuation of underground nuclear blasts will not lead to an end of the nuclear armament race, as a result of which, the threat of thermonuclear war will only increase.

V.V. Kuznetsov also refuted Dean's allegation that the ending of tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water, even though underground tests are continued, is enough to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons. On the contrary, the Soviet delegate said, the legalization of underground tests will be a stimulus to states which want to create their own nuclear weapons.

The Soviet delegate drew the attention of the Committee to another serious danger contained in the proposal of the United States and Britain. This proposal, Kuznetsov said, is obviously aimed at providing Western powers with one-sided military advantages to the detriment of the interests of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. As is known, the United States of America has been using underground tests to improve its nuclear weapons for many years already. Should underground nuclear tests be legalized with a simultaneous prohibition of such tests in the atmosphere, this would mean that the United States could continue improving its nuclear weapons, increase their yield and effectivity, whereas the Soviet Union would have its hands bound in the question of strengthening its defence potentiality.

The Soviet Government, Kuznetsov concluded, firmly abides by the position that it is necessary to reach agreement without delay on the ending of all tests of nuclear weapons without exception — in the atmosphere, outer space, under water and under the ground. The extensive discussion, which took place on this subject in the Committee, has shown with exhaustive clarity that this task can and must be solved.

We offer the Western powers to reach agreement on the ending of all nuclear weapon tests no matter in what media they are held. The Soviet Union is ready to approach this question in the most constructive way and to take into account all the useful considerations expressed in the course of the discussion by different delegations. And to find more speedily a solution to the problem of discontinuing nuclear tests, we have a sound basis — the memorandum of the eight neutralist states.

The Soviet Union also supports the other proposals of the representatives of neutral states, aimed, as they are, at facilitating the settlement of disputed questions. In this connection attention should be paid to the proposal that nuclear powers should commit themselves not to hold any nuclear tests, as of a definite date, say the beginning of 1963.

The solution of the problem of ending all nuclear weapon tests depends now only on the Western powers. If they agree, at last, to accept the neutrals' memorandum as a basis, by deed and not in words — then the road to such a settlement will be open.

EXCERPTS FROM PREVIOUS STATEMENTS OF KHRUSHCHOV ON THE QUESTION OF BANNING NUCLEAR TESTS

N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., has spoken on many occasions in the past on the banning of nuclear tests and many times expressed opposition to the proposal of the U.S. and British Governments for a partial nuclear test ban treaty which excludes underground tests.

Following are excerpts from statements made by Khrushchov on this question over the last few years:

In a report at the fourth session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on January 14, 1960, entitled "Disarmament for Durable Peace and Friendship," Khrushchov denounced U.S. President Eisenhower's declaration that the United States would resume nuclear tests and his attempt to defend the resumption of underground nuclear testing under the pretext that the technical means to detect nuclear explosions were imperfect.

Khrushchov said, "We wish to re-emphasize that **the Soviet Union holds firmly to the view that all types of nuclear weapon tests in the air, on the ground, under ground, and under water must be discontinued. If a decision were adopted to ban tests only in the atmosphere, this would shatter the peoples' hopes of a complete discontinuance of tests.**"

In a memorandum to U.S. President Kennedy published on June 11, 1961, on the ending of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests, Khrushchov said: "The position of the Soviet Government at the Geneva talks is clear and simple. The Soviet Union wants nuclear weapon tests of all kinds to be ended

everywhere and for all time. **But the Soviet Government cannot agree and will never agree to the test ban treaty becoming an empty scrap of paper which could be used as a cover for further experiments with nuclear weapons for the purpose of improving them and developing new means of mass destruction. There can be no exemptions from the treaty: all kinds of nuclear weapon tests must be banned,** in the air, under water, underground, and in outer space."

Speaking over the radio and television on June 15, 1961, on his meeting with Kennedy in Vienna, Khrushchov said, "It is clear to everyone, of course, that the ending of nuclear weapon tests would not by itself prevent a nuclear missile war. We can ban nuclear weapon tests, but the existing stockpiles will remain, the production of these arms will continue and, consequently, their stockpiling will go on. **Thus the danger of a nuclear missile war will keep mounting.** It is quite obvious that **the ending of nuclear weapon tests would on its own not be some sort of a dam barring the way to the arms race.**"

At a mass meeting welcoming the Government Delegation of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam in the Kremlin in Moscow on June 28, 1961, Khrushchov said: "The discontinuation of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests, on which the Western countries now centre their attention, **does not in itself solve the problem.** The Soviet Union is against any nuclear explosions. Our Government has always been and remains in favour of an international agreement banning nuclear tests under strict and equal international control. The conclusion of such an agreement is obstructed by the refusal of our American and British partners in negotiations to take the Soviet interests into account. I would like to say once again that the discontinuation of nuclear weapon tests in itself will not rid the peoples of the threat of a devastating war. General and complete disarmament would be a cardinal solution."

On September 3, 1961, U.S. President Kennedy and British Prime Minister Macmillan in a joint statement proposed that

the Soviet Union, the United States and Britain conclude an agreement on the cessation of nuclear tests in the atmosphere. They proposed that in the absence of an agreement with regard to inspection and means of control, tests in the atmosphere be discontinued indefinitely while permitting underground and high altitude tests. This proposal was at that time rejected by the Soviet Union.

Speaking at the Soviet-Indian friendship meeting held in Moscow on September 8, 1961, Khrushchov said of the above U.S.-British joint statement: **"The Governments of the United States and Britain now pose as the most zealous opponents of nuclear tests. They even came out with a proposal against holding any nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, because this is injurious to human health. But they did not expect their proposal to be seriously discussed, let alone accepted. This was purely a propaganda device designed to mislead public opinion."**

Khrushchov added, "The entire purport of the proposals of the United States and Britain is to gain unilateral military advantages over the Soviet Union. They proposed agreement to ban tests only in the atmosphere, while underground explosions could be carried on. Moreover, France would not be bound by any restrictions on nuclear weapon tests which she is conducting in the interests of the whole NATO bloc, because the test ban would not extend to her in general.

"By their proposals the leaders of the United States and Britain wanted to confuse people not versed in the tricks of Western diplomacy. **They try to take cover behind talk about love of man, about human health. But at the same time they are stockpiling, at a furious pace, means for destroying human life.**

"There is an apt saying: if the head is gone, no use crying over the coiffure. The imperialist gentlemen are preparing death for people in the fire of war and they chatter about people's health.

"They themselves threaten us, work up tension to the limit, and expect us not to take measures to strengthen our security and world peace! There is no other name for this but sacrilege."

On September 9, 1961, Khrushchov issued a statement in connection with the joint statement dated September 3, 1961, of the U.S. President and the Prime Minister of Great Britain on nuclear weapon tests. Khrushchov's statement said: "First of all, one's attention is caught by the fact that the leaders of the United States and Britain have not uttered a single word about the gravity of the period we are living through, about the tense international situation, although they should realize, one would think, that the position with regard to nuclear tests cannot be considered in isolation from this situation. It is precisely from the Governments of the United States and Britain, which decide matters in the Western military blocs, that the peoples have a right to expect a clear and direct reply **as to when they will finally discontinue their sabre-rattling, when they will finally stop pushing the world toward the catastrophe of nuclear war?**

"Leaving all this aside, Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Macmillan not only divorce the question of nuclear weapon tests from the problem of disarmament, of which it is part, but are trying to consider it in isolation, as though in a test-tube, unrelated to important international events. **Each line of the statement by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain reveals a desire, cost what it may, to ensure for the Western powers and their allies in aggressive military blocs unilateral military advantages to the detriment of the security interests of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states.** Moreover, the leaders of the United States and Britain are even trying to make it look as though their joint statement was dictated by concern for the easing of international tension, for the interests of all mankind. But **no matter what high-sounding words the leaders of the United States and the British Government choose in their**

attempt to whitewash their line in the question of nuclear weapons, these cannot help them to put over an aggressive policy as a peaceful one, barbarity as humanism.

"To make clear the purposes of this statement, let us see what is its concrete content.

"The statement advances the proposal that the Soviet Union, the United States of America and Britain should immediately reach agreement not to hold nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere provided, however, that the question of experimental blasts of such weapons underground and in outer space should not be affected by such an agreement.

"It is not very difficult to guess the meaning of this proposal. They propose to us that the United States and Britain, let alone France which remains altogether outside this proposal, should retain the opportunity to go on improving their nuclear weapons. But even this is not enough for them. **They have to try to see whether they can manage to tie the hands of the Soviet Union even tighter in the raising of its defence potential.** In other words, they want to kill two birds with one propaganda stone: **to get the Soviet Union's blessing on their preparations in the sphere of nuclear armaments, and at the same time trip up their partner in the negotiations — the Soviet Union.**

"Indeed, it is common knowledge that **the program of developing new types of nuclear weapons which has been drawn up in the United States now requires precisely underground tests, that is the kind of experiments to which** the American-British proposal **is to give the green light.** For several years the United States has striven at the Geneva negotiations of the three nuclear powers **to legalize underground nuclear tests,** which has been one of the main obstacles to the conclusion of a treaty on the complete stopping of nuclear tests. After all, it is an open secret that the United States has long since planned underground nuclear tests and appropriate pits and huge underground galleries are kept in readiness in the state of Nevada.

"If any further proof was needed that the objectives of the joint statement of the United States President and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom are too transparent, it was furnished by Mr. Kennedy himself when he issued instructions to resume underground nuclear tests on September 5, i.e., the day following the message to the Soviet Union. The Government of the United States was so impatient that it evidently did not even occur to it, if only for the sake of appearance, to wait for the Soviet Government's reply to the American-British statement. Does this not show that from the very outset it was not intending to concert its actions with the forthcoming reply of the Soviet Government to this statement?

"This is not the first time the Governments of the United States and Britain have sought to confine a nuclear test ban to tests in the atmosphere alone. They made similar proposals, for instance, in 1959. Why has the Soviet Government always been against such an approach to the question of discontinuing nuclear weapon tests? Because **agreement on the cessation of one kind of tests only — in the atmosphere — would be a disservice to the cause of peace. It would mean deceiving the peoples. Such agreement could create the harmful and dangerous illusion among the peoples that steps were being taken to put an end to the arms race, while in fact nothing of the kind would have been done.** In fact, the states would continue, in a sort of legalized way, to improve existing types of atomic and hydrogen weapons, using for this purpose underground tests, including those for so-called peaceful purposes, and tests in outer space. Besides, there would still be the possibility of designing new, still more destructive types of nuclear weapons on the basis of the data obtained as a result of these experiments. Of course, the military circles of the NATO member states would just rub their hands with glee, since they know full well that **the implementation of such a plan would only add grist to the mill of the NATO bloc — the potential aggressor.**

"Thus, the nuclear arms race would continue and its dangerous consequences would be no whit less than they are now. The conclusion of an agreement that started a kind of race in underground nuclear tests, and if you like in outer space or under water, could be assessed by the peoples, and with good reason at that, **as a dishonest deal. Of course, the Soviet Government cannot and will not strike such a bargain. A deal of this nature is wanted by those who build their policy on deceit of the peoples, on playing at negotiation.**

"The Soviet Union stands for the ending of all kinds of nuclear weapon tests, without any exception, everywhere and for all time to come."

In an interview with the *New York Times* commentator Sulzberger, which was released on September 10, 1961 by Tass, Khrushchov said: **"What use would there be in cessation of tests if the arms race continued and war industry went on working full blast creating nuclear weapons in ever growing numbers? . . .**

"I would say this would be in some way **tantamount to lulling public opinion, lulling man's vigilance. People would think something had been done to prevent war while in effect nothing was being done, and on the contrary the military machine would go on working full blast.**

"Besides, the Kennedy-Macmillan proposal says nothing on cessation of underground test explosions and on so-called explosions for peaceful purposes. . . .

"Thus the proposals put forward by President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan are not aimed at assuring security for nations but to pursue propaganda purposes to shift responsibility onto others while they themselves quietly continue their old policy of stockpiling thermonuclear weapons and preparing war against the socialist countries. We cannot agree to that. We must soberly assess the situation and take care of our own security."

EXCERPTS FROM PREVIOUS STATEMENTS AND MEMORANDUMS OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT ON THE QUESTION OF BANNING NUCLEAR TESTS

The Soviet Government has issued within the last few years many statements and memorandums on the question of banning nuclear tests. Following are excerpts from its memorandum of September 28, 1961 concerning nuclear weapon tests and from two statements of August 31 and December 4, 1961.

The Soviet Government said in its memorandum on nuclear weapon tests dated September 28, 1961: "Taking into consideration the interest of many U.N. member states in the question of nuclear weapon tests, the Soviet Government deems it necessary to present to the United Nations its position on this question, which is closely and indissolubly tied to the task of general and complete disarmament."

The memorandum added: "This policy of the U.S.A., Britain and France to secure unilateral military advantages over the Soviet Union was made perfectly obvious during the Geneva talks on a treaty to discontinue nuclear weapon tests.

"The Government of the U.S.A. stubbornly sought to legalize underground testing of nuclear weapons, inasmuch as the United States had long ago developed a programme for perfecting nuclear weapons precisely by the method of carrying out underground tests in the mine and underground galleries in the state of Nevada.

"With the same objective of securing loopholes for itself to be used in the further improvement of nuclear weapons, the U.S. Government persistently demanded that the Soviet Union agree to an indefinite number of nuclear explosions for so-

called 'peaceful purposes.' Anyone who knows something about modern nuclear techniques is aware that a nuclear installation that serves so-called 'peaceful objectives' will serve military objectives as well and may be used to perfect nuclear weapons.

"These demands, stubbornly repeated over a long period of time, were used as a smokescreen for the intensified preparations in the U.S.A. for underground testing of nuclear weapons. In 1960, the U.S.A. started large-scale preparations for another series of nuclear weapon tests. U.S. officials did not even think it necessary to conceal these preparations. The American press published reports on the preparatory work, photographs of the tunnels, statements of high-ranking officials in the U.S.A. about the necessity of the earliest possible resumption of nuclear tests, etc.

"It is characteristic that **on September 5, 1961, it was already announced that the U.S.A. was undertaking a large-scale programme of just such underground tests.** Even more — the message of the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Britain, dated September 3 this year and forwarded to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., also contained a proposal to agree only to ban nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere. **As to the question regarding underground and space tests explosions of these weapons, it was separated from the suggested agreement and this again showed the tendency on the part of the United States and Britain to reserve for themselves the possibility of carrying out nuclear tests and to tie the hands of the Soviet Union in taking measures to improve its defence ability.**

"While the Geneva delegates of three powers were negotiating the question of nuclear tests, the U.S.A., Britain, France, the Federal German Republic and other NATO member states continued to intensify the arms race, particularly the race in nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons.

"Practical preparations were started in NATO to equip the West German Bundeswehr with rocket and nuclear weapons.

More and more American military bases designed as a springboard of aggression against the socialist states were built with feverish haste all over the world."

The memorandum said: "The Western powers' policy of preparation for war, their intensified military preparations and the sabotage of the decision of the U.N. General Assembly to achieve agreement on general and complete disarmament threw new light on the entire question of discontinuing nuclear weapon tests. **It became clear that the conclusion of a separate treaty on discontinuing nuclear tests at a time when the Western powers were pursuing a reckless arms race could only create a general illusion that something was being done to prevent a nuclear war, whereas the Western powers were actually pushing matters precisely to such a war.**

"The conclusion of a treaty on discontinuing nuclear tests in such an atmosphere and in isolation from a programme for general and complete disarmament **could only give the peoples of the world a false sense of security, and would act as a kind of drug to lull their vigilance on the question of the preservation of peace.**

"Indeed, it is perfectly clear that **a treaty on discontinuing tests, by itself would not, for a single day, check the accumulation by the nuclear powers of weapons of mass annihilation, to say nothing of the fact that the available stocks of these weapons would remain intact.** For instance, if the West German revanchists and militarists, backed by the U.S.A. and NATO, were to jeopardize the fate of mankind in a mad attempt to forcibly revise in their favour the results of the last war and to draw the NATO member states into another world slaughter, **a treaty on the ending of tests would be no obstacle to the employment of nuclear weapons.**

"Hence, **the conclusion of a treaty on the ending of tests, in isolation from the general problem of disarmament and with a continual nuclear arms race in progress, besides failing to do any good to the cause of peace, might even lead to the**

contrary — it might camouflage preparations for a nuclear war."

The memorandum pointed out: **"With the Western powers continuing the nuclear armaments race, the conclusion of a separate treaty on the ending of nuclear tests could not help resolve the problem of preventing the further spread of nuclear weapons. Since the nuclear arms race is not being discontinued, there is no one to prevent states which do not so far have nuclear weapons from mobilizing their research and technical potential to develop this weapon.**

"A three-power ban on nuclear weapon tests negotiated in Geneva, would in isolation from general and complete disarmament place states under no obligations but moral ones. And France crassly violated all such moral obligations and did this with the good offices of the U.S.A. and Britain. In reply to the statement that the three powers had discontinued atomic tests it was said that the U.S.S.R., U.S.A., and Britain had already tested nuclear weapons and were manufacturing them, whereas France was also eager to join the 'nuclear club,' i.e., to manufacture nuclear weapons and conduct unrestricted tests. It follows that if persistent and resolute struggle is not conducted for general and complete disarmament, no one can guarantee that some other states will not start testing their nuclear weapons tomorrow, even if the three-power treaty on the discontinuation of tests were a fact.

"The facts must be looked in the face: **The question at issue is not the harmful effects of atomic radiation on living organisms but the deliverance of mankind from the danger of a thermonuclear war, the saving of tens and hundreds of millions of human lives, the prevention of the use of atomic weapons,** and this can be achieved only by general and complete disarmament. This is the main aim, the main task."

The memorandum said: **"What then, would it mean, in present conditions, if the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A. and Britain concluded a treaty on the ending of tests? Nothing but the**

legalization of a system under which the Soviet Union — a powerful bulwark of peace, independence, and the security of peoples — **would be robbed of the possibility of improving its nuclear weapons, which are necessary for the defence of peace, in a world where general and complete disarmament had not been implemented, while the Western powers would be continuing tests of new and more destructive types of atomic and hydrogen weapons in preparation for war. To allow such a situation to develop would be tantamount to encouraging the aggressors to carry out their designs, which are dangerous for the whole of mankind."**

The memorandum said: "What is the way out? How could the question of ending nuclear weapon tests be solved in present conditions?

"The Soviet Government perceives a real and reasonable way out by settling the question of ending nuclear tests not in an isolation but on the basis of general and complete disarmament. Such an approach will sweep away all obstacles and difficulties, stop up any loopholes and preclude circumventions which those who do not want peace, who are banking on deceiving the peoples might try to make use of.

"If the states implement general and complete disarmament under effective international control, if all types of weapons, including nuclear weapons, are liquidated and armies disbanded, there will be no incentive to improve nuclear weapons, and so to carry out tests of such weapons. Then, no one will be tempted to test nuclear weapons on the ground, underground, in the atmosphere or in outer space, and there will be nothing to test, since nuclear weapons will have been destroyed."

The Soviet Government in a statement of August 31, 1961, on its decision to resume nuclear weapon tests said: **"Agreement on a test stoppage would not of itself put an end to the arms race. States already possessing nuclear weapons would inevitably be tempted to act in contravention of such an agreement, search for new ways and loopholes for perfecting**

their weapons, apart from the fact that the tests conducted by three or four powers are quite sufficient for unlimited stockpiling of the most dangerous thermonuclear weapons of existing types."

The statement said that the Soviet Union "over many years consistently and perseveringly worked for cessation of all types of nuclear weapon testing, everywhere and for all time. With that aim in view, it unilaterally ceased nuclear testing, though that entailed a certain risk, inasmuch as the U.S.A. and Britain had carried out more nuclear tests than the U.S.S.R. and it was thanks to the initiative and efforts of the Soviet Union that the three nuclear powers began their negotiations in Geneva. Throughout these negotiations the Soviet Government patiently sought mutually acceptable solutions, repeatedly taking important steps to meet the wishes of the United States and Britain.

"But what policy did the Western powers oppose to the Soviet Government's clear and sincere position?

"Their reply to the Soviet Union's unilateral cessation of nuclear testing was to carry out a series of nuclear bomb explosions of unparalleled intensity. The Soviet Union repeatedly sought to bring the positions of the three negotiating powers closer together. But every time the U.S.A. and Britain replied by going back on their own proposals, on which they had insisted only yesterday, and did everything they could to prevent agreement. In effect, they cancelled out the unanimous findings and recommendations of the scientific experts, including their own, American and British, experts, on methods of detecting nuclear explosions and appropriate control of a test stoppage treaty.

"The Western powers insisted, and still insist, that the test stoppage treaty should not include a ban on underground nuclear explosions. Yet it should be perfectly clear to every informed person that such explosions, even if it is claimed that they are carried out for peaceful purposes, are merely a disguised form of perfecting existing types of nuclear weapons or experimenting with new types. A nuclear device that can be effectively employed for, say, 'earth-removal' explosions — and the Western powers want to secure for themselves the right to conduct such explosions — can be effectively employed for military purposes. **In other words, while professing a desire to stop nuclear testing, the United States, and also Britain, are actually pursuing another purpose, namely, to build into the treaty loopholes for continued perfection of thermonuclear weapons through underground testing or through explosions for supposedly peaceful purposes."**

"The whole record of the Geneva talks is convincing proof that **the Western powers' object is factual legalization of the types of nuclear tests in which they are interested, and establishment of an international control body that would be their pliant tool and in effect, an appendage of their general staffs. The hypocritical statements of U.S. and British representatives on cessation of testing and international control have proved to be no more than camouflage."**

The Soviet Government in a statement dated December 4, 1961, on the negotiations for the discontinuance of nuclear weapon tests said: "Is there anyone who does not realize that the continuation of nuclear weapon tests by the Western powers anywhere — underground, in the atmosphere, in outer space or under water — would deal a blow at the aspirations of the peoples especially at the time when, thanks to the new initiative of the Soviet Union the green light has been given to the immediate conclusion of an agreement to end all nuclear tests."

The statement added: "The Soviet Government declares firmly that **if the Western powers continue testing their nuclear weapons, underground included, the Soviet Union will be compelled, in order to safeguard its security, to hold such nuclear weapon tests as it will deem necessary for consolidation of its defence capacity."**

FROM CONCESSION TO CAPITULATION

—THE RECORD OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT IN THE NEGOTIATIONS FOR HALTING NUCLEAR TESTS

In the talks held between the Soviet Union and the West in the past few years on disarmament and the banning of nuclear weapons, the United States and its allies have persisted in their stubborn reactionary stand and they have used the talks as a smokescreen for their arms drive and war preparations. On the other hand, the Soviet Government has made one concession after another to meet the demands of the other party. Abandoning the fundamental principled stand, it has finally accepted a reproduction of the U.S.-British draft treaty and in Moscow on July 25 concluded with them the partial nuclear test ban treaty, thus jointly perpetrating a great fraud upon the people of the world.

The following review shows how the Soviet Government retreated step by step on this question till it fell on its knees and capitulated:

As early as a year after the end of World War II, **the Soviet Union, on June 19, 1946, submitted to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission the draft of an international convention for the banning of atomic weapons, which stipulated that the contracting parties "solemnly declare that they are unanimously resolved to prohibit the production and employment of weapons based on the use of atomic energy." In the many years following, the Soviet Union persistently worked for the prohibition of the use, manufacture and stockpiling of atomic weapons and consistently exposed the various plots of the United States, Britain and other Western countries**

to obstruct agreement on the question of banning atomic weapons.

After the Soviet Union declared in 1949 that it had its own atomic weapons as early as 1947, it still firmly adhered to its clear and definite stand for the prohibition of atomic weapons and disarmament. **Between 1952 and 1956, the Soviet Union submitted to the United Nations and its related organizations a series of proposals for the "unconditional" and "total" prohibition of the use, manufacture and stockpiling of nuclear weapons and the reduction of conventional armaments.**

In its proposal "Concerning the Conclusion of an International Convention on the Reduction of Armaments and the Prohibition of Atomic Weapons" submitted on May 10, 1955, the Soviet Union for the first time raised the question of banning nuclear tests. However, in that proposal, this question was put forward only **"as one of the first measures for the execution of the programme for the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons."** The draft convention also provided for **the undertaking by the various countries of the obligation not to use nuclear weapons and the dismantling of army, navy and air force bases in foreign countries.**

During this period, the United States and its allies, while repeatedly rejecting Soviet proposals, put forward their own "open sky" and other proposals which were aimed at gathering intelligence data on the defence capacities of other countries, and they tenaciously harped on the question of control. The entire position of the Western powers could be reduced to the following: they wished to manacle and weaken the defence capacity of the Soviet Union and to carry on espionage and reconnaissance activities against her; they wished to engage in empty talk about "control" without disarmament, with a view to freely continuing the expansion of arms and the making of war preparations as well as pursuing the nuclear armaments drive.

In 1957, the Soviet Union went back on its position of regarding the nuclear test ban as part of a total ban on nuclear weapons and proposed for the first time in March that year that the question of banning nuclear tests be settled as a separate question from the general question of the total prohibition of nuclear weapons. It also appealed to the United States and Britain to reach agreement with itself on this question. In 1958, the Soviet Union announced a unilateral cessation of nuclear tests and repeatedly stressed the necessity of reaching an agreement, as soon as possible, on the banning of nuclear tests so as to prevent other countries from possessing nuclear weapons.

On the Soviet Union's initiative, the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union began their talks on the prohibition of nuclear tests at the end of October 1958 in Geneva. These negotiations can be divided into two stages. The first stage lasted from the end of October 1958 to the end of January 1962 and consisted of 353 sessions, during which time the three nations participated in the "conference for the discontinuance of nuclear testing." Following the indefinite recess of the conference the second stage of the negotiations began, namely, the submission for continued discussion to the U.N. Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee of the question of banning nuclear testing.

During the 353 sessions of the tripartite talks, two principal questions were discussed. One was the question of a nuclear test ban and the other was the question of a nuclear test ban control.

Throughout the talks, **the Soviet Government in 1960 and 1961 released one after another a large number of statements and documents opposing the separate conclusion of a nuclear test ban treaty, especially a partial nuclear test ban treaty which would make an exception of underground nuclear tests, and pointing out that this was a trick to fool the peoples and to help the aggressors to realize their plot to endanger mankind. However, in face of Western insistence and pressure,**

the Soviet Government failed to maintain a consistent position.

On the question of a nuclear test ban, the first of the two principal questions discussed at the talks, the Soviet Union at first advocated a total nuclear test ban. The United States, in the first stage of the talks, put forward the proposal that nuclear test ban should not include high altitude and underground tests; then it modified its plan to exclude underground tests below a certain yield. The Soviet Union indicated that it could agree to a partial test ban under certain conditions. **In November 1961, it officially declared its acceptance of the Western position of prohibiting only nuclear weapon tests conducted in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space.** The Soviet Government at the same time demanded that the countries concerned should refrain from conducting underground tests pending an agreement on the question of control with regard to such tests. But this proposal was rejected by the United States and Britain.

In a memorandum on the cessation of nuclear testing forwarded to U.S. President Kennedy in June 1961, Khrushchov reversed the Soviet stand that the prohibition of nuclear tests should be dealt with separately from the question of disarmament and proposed that **the question of discontinuing nuclear tests be solved by starting with the question of general and complete disarmament.** Following this the three-power Geneva conference made no progress and its indefinite recess was announced at the end of January 1962. Following this, in March 1962, the Soviet Union indicated its willingness to form with the Western countries a "Subcommittee on the Banning of Nuclear Tests" under the U.N. Disarmament Committee in Geneva to continue the discussion exclusively of the question of prohibiting nuclear tests. In his letter to U Thant, U.N. Secretary-General, in the same month, the Soviet Foreign Minister once again clearly put forward the concept of "preventing the further proliferation of nuclear weapons" which the Soviet Union had expounded as early as 1958.

On August 27, 1962, the United States and Britain at the Geneva disarmament talks put forward two draft treaties for a complete or partial nuclear test ban and asked the Soviet Union to choose one. The first draft treaty for a "complete" test ban stipulated that an "International Scientific Commission" be established to check the implementation of the treaty. This commission could appoint officials to form groups to conduct "on-site inspections" on the territory of or controlled by any of the parties to the treaty. The second draft treaty stipulated the discontinuance of test explosions of nuclear weapons in only three spheres, "in the atmosphere, above the atmosphere, or in the territorial or high seas," and excluded underground nuclear tests.

Later developments proved that the Soviet Union had accepted as the basis for the negotiations the second U.S.-British draft whose substance was entirely incorporated in the agreement concluded on July 25, 1963. Meanwhile, **the demand put forward by Khrushchov in his speech of July 2 in Berlin that a non-aggression pact be concluded between the NATO members and Warsaw Treaty countries when an agreement on the banning of nuclear tests was signed did not materialize because the West firmly rejected it.**

Over the second question discussed — the control of a nuclear test ban, the Soviet Union also acted contrary to the correct stand it had taken after World War II. The Soviet Union at that time denounced the schemes of the United States and its allies to reject disarmament on the pretext that "effective international control" was needed. It indicated that it did not oppose international control if it was designed to bring about the prohibition of atomic weapons, but it insisted that international control was out of the question unless, in the first place, stipulations were made prohibiting atomic weapons. At the same time, the Soviet Union stressed that the powers and functions of the control organization must be strictly defined and they should not become arbitrary and unlimited and that no interference in other countries' internal affairs and infringement of their state sovereignty should be tolerated on the pretext of international control.

From the very beginning of the three-power Geneva conference in 1958, the Soviet Union expressed agreement to the establishment of "control posts" on Soviet territory. At the end of April 1959, it abandoned the principle of unanimity it had advocated for agreement among the three powers in the control organizations. In the following year it agreed that "on-site inspection" could be conducted on Soviet territory "about three times" a year. In addition, it agreed that the "control posts" could be manned mostly by foreign personnel.

After the United States and Britain put forward their own proposals in August 1962, the Soviet Union, with a view to meeting Western demands, proposed in December of the same year that each nuclear power should have unmanned "automatic seismic stations" — known as "black boxes" — on their own territory. It expressed readiness to set up three such stations on Soviet territory and to permit the entry of foreign inspectors into the Soviet Union to check the records of automatic observation installations. Then Kennedy demanded an extension of areas where the automatic observation stations could be sited, and an increase in the number of on-site inspections. Khrushchov in his reply of January this year to Kennedy indicated that he would not object to inspections in non-seismic areas.

Three crucial questions stood out throughout the Geneva negotiations. First, whether the cessation of nuclear tests should be taken as a part of the general task of achieving a total ban on nuclear weapons to check the nuclear arms race and to eliminate the danger of nuclear war or whether it should be dealt with in isolation from this general task? Secondly, whether there should be a total ban on nuclear weapon tests or a partial ban which would permit and legalize underground tests? And, thirdly, what sort of international control should be permitted? Leaders of the Soviet Government and its representatives to the negotiations have made a great number of

statements and proposals on these issues, but in practice they have gone back on their words and finally submitted and capitulated to U.S. imperialism, after forsaking their own correct position and principled stand.

1. On the question of the relationship between general disarmament and the prohibition of nuclear weapons on the one hand and the ban on nuclear weapon tests on the other.

On September 10, 1961, the Soviet news agency Tass carried the text of the *New York Times* commentator C.L. Sulzberger's interview with Khrushchov. **Khrushchov said: "Cessation of thermonuclear tests without solution of the disarmament problem would not meet the main goal. What use would there be in cessation of tests if the arms race continued and war industry went on working full blast creating nuclear weapons in ever growing numbers?"**

The Soviet Government said in its memorandum dated September 28, 1961, on nuclear weapon tests: "It became clear that the conclusion of a separate treaty on discontinuing nuclear tests at a time when the Western powers were pursuing a reckless arms race could only create a general illusion that something was being done to prevent a nuclear war, whereas the Western powers were actually pushing matters precisely to such a war. . . . The conclusion of a treaty on the ending of tests, in isolation from the general problem of disarmament and with a continual nuclear arms race in progress, besides failing to do any good to the cause of peace, might even lead to the contrary — it might camouflage preparations for a nuclear war."

On January 26, 1962, the Soviet representative S.K. Tsarapkin read out a Soviet Government statement at the conference on ending nuclear weapon tests **which said: "The Soviet Government has repeatedly pointed out that a final solution of the problem of ending nuclear weapon tests is only possible given general and complete disarmament. When nuclear weapons are banned and all stockpiles liquidated, there will be no incentive for testing them."**

But a proposal contradictory to this had been put forward as early as March 18, 1957, by the Soviet representative V.A. Zorin in his speech at the meeting of the subcommittee of the Disarmament Commission. He said: **"It is however expedient at the present time to single out from the general problem of banning atomic and hydrogen weapons the question of stopping tests of these weapons and to solve it now without linking agreement on the termination of tests with agreement on other disarmament problems."** During the Geneva negotiations which started in October 1958, the Soviet Government, in the main, in spite of its changeable position, followed this line pointed out by Zorin.

2. On the question of a total or partial ban on tests.

Khrushchov said in a statement issued on September 9, 1961: "Agreement on the cessation of one kind of tests only — in the atmosphere — would be a disservice to the cause of peace." He said that this would be **"a dishonest deal. Of course, the Soviet Government cannot and will not strike such a bargain. A deal of this nature is wanted by those who build their policy on deceit of the peoples, on playing at negotiation."** Khrushchov said in an interview with *Pravda* on August 30, 1958, that the Soviet Union's point of departure in the negotiations on ending nuclear weapon tests was that "such talks must have as their purpose the conclusion of an agreement to end tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons of all kinds by all countries for all time to come."

On October 31, 1958, the very day the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union began their talks on the discontinuance of nuclear testing in Geneva, the Soviet Union put forward at the meeting a draft agreement which stipulates that the three contracting parties "shall not conduct testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons of any type."

But shortly after the talks began, the U.S. delegate, with ulterior motives, put forward a proposal for a partial nuclear test ban to the exclusion of underground tests.

In an interview with a Hsinhua News Agency correspondent in Geneva on January 14, 1960, S.K. Tsarapkin, the Soviet representative attending the talks on the discontinuance of nuclear testing, said that the Soviet Government had again proposed conclusion of a treaty banning all nuclear explosions, not only explosions in the atmosphere and under water, but also underground.

He emphasized that continued underground nuclear testing would step up the nuclear weapons race and that the resulting radiation would impair the health of mankind.

After the advent of the Kennedy Administration in 1961, the U.S. and British representatives jointly put forward a draft treaty on stopping nuclear tests on April 18 at the Geneva conference. This draft treaty again exempted underground nuclear tests of small yields.

The Soviet representative S.K. Tsarapkin said on April 19 at the talks that "there is nothing new" in the entire draft treaty jointly submitted by the U.S. and British representatives for immediate signing and that it was "unacceptable" to the Soviet Union.

Later the Soviet representative indicated that he could agree to the U.S. proposal under certain conditions, that is, the various countries should continue to negotiate for a cessation of underground tests and they should refrain from or temporarily cease underground tests while the negotiations were in progress. The U.S. and British representatives rejected this proposal.

On the third day after the United States and Britain jointly submitted two draft treaties on a total and on a partial ban on nuclear tests to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee on August 27, 1962, V. Kuznetsov, head of the Soviet delegation, exposed the danger of the second draft treaty. He pointed out that the proposal was obviously aimed at providing the Western powers with one-sided military advantages to the detriment of the interests of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. He noted that the United States had

been using underground tests to improve its nuclear weapons for many years already. Should underground nuclear tests be legalized with a simultaneous prohibition of such tests in the atmosphere, this would mean that the United States could continue improving its nuclear weapons, increase their yield and effectivity, whereas the Soviet Union would have its hands bound in the question of strengthening its defence potentiality.

However, **hardly a year has passed and the Soviet Union has, on July 25, concluded with the United States and Britain a partial nuclear test ban treaty which is an exact reproduction of the partial test ban draft treaty advanced by the United States and Britain mentioned above.**

3. On the question of international control.

At a session of the tripartite talks in Geneva on the discontinuance of nuclear tests on July 10, 1961, Soviet delegate S.K. Tsarapkin **said that now the United States was striving to impose a treaty which would ensure its "freedom of action," that is, a treaty that would permit the United States to resume nuclear weapon tests at any time it wanted, and would permit it to institute control without disarmament.** The United States' insistence on such an unacceptable proposal was evidently an attempt to conduct espionage activities by utilizing the broad possibilities provided by a control system.

In a note to the U.S. Government on August 9, 1961, on the question of the cessation of nuclear tests, the Soviet Government pointed out that **the efforts of the United States were aimed mainly at actual legalization of the holding of tests and creating such an international control agency which would be a pliant tool in the hands of the Western powers and would be used by their general staffs to collect required intelligence.**

On January 2, 1962, the Soviet Government said in a statement forwarded to the U.N. Disarmament Committee that the U.S. and British Governments wanted to have such a treaty because, on the one hand, it would, in fact, allow the aggressive NATO military bloc to continue nuclear weapon testing

and, on the other, it would set up espionage networks on the territories of other countries under the signboard of "international control."

The statement also said the fact that **"the Western powers so insistently demand what they call 'international control' is a proof that they are out to achieve this for the sake of the interests of their own general staffs, in order to facilitate and expedite the drafting of criminal projects for attacking peace-loving states."**

On January 26, 1962, the Soviet Government in a statement concerning the question of halting nuclear weapon tests said that the United States wanted, just as it did in the past, to set up an international espionage network under the guise of "international control" of the discontinuation of nuclear weapon tests.

But, **pressed by the United States, the Soviet Union has made retreat after retreat over this question. As early as the summer of 1958 at a session of the eight-nation nuclear experts conference in Geneva, the Soviet Union, in disregard of the interests of the other countries, agreed with the West on the establishment of a network of about 180 "control posts" throughout the world: on continents and on islands, as well as on ships. On December 10, 1962, the Soviet delegate, in order to satisfy the demands of the U.S. and British delegates, advanced a further proposal at the Disarmament Committee meeting that unmanned "automatic seismic stations" ("black boxes") be installed on the territory of the "nuclear powers," and said that the Soviet Union was ready to set up three such stations in the Soviet Far East, Central Asia and the Altai area. The Soviet delegate further indicated that the Soviet Union was ready to permit the entry of foreign inspectors into the Soviet Union to check the records of automatic observation installations.** The Soviet Union also demanded that such stations be installed in countries "near the borders" of the nuclear powers. In a message in reply to Kennedy on December 19, 1962, Khrushchov expressed agreement, "when it is found necessary, to have two-three inspections a year" "in areas where some suspicious ground shocks may occur."

However, Kennedy was not satisfied with this. In a reply to Khrushchov on December 28, 1962, he said that the establishment of three automatic seismic stations did "not seem to me to go far enough." He demanded that on-site inspection should be allowed in areas in the Soviet Union where earthquakes do not usually occur. Kennedy also demanded the establishment of automatic seismic stations in the Kamchatka and Tashkent zones of the Soviet Union. He further demanded that stations be set up in Hokkaido in Japan, Pakistan and Afghanistan. Kennedy also demanded that the number of "on-site" inspections be increased to, say, "eight to ten" times a year.

Under pressure from Kennedy, Khrushchov, in a reply to Kennedy on January 7 this year, indicated that the Soviet Union would not object to inspections in non-seismic areas,

EXCERPTS FROM KENNEDY'S RADIO AND TELEVISION SPEECH ON THE TRIPARTITE TREATY

July 26, 1963

In his radio and television address on July 26, U.S. President Kennedy declared that the partial nuclear test ban treaty initialled by the United States, United Kingdom and Soviet Union "is a limited treaty which **permits continued underground testing** and prohibits only those tests that we ourselves can police."

He admitted candidly that **it did not "mean an end to the threat of nuclear war. It will not reduce nuclear stockpiles; it will not halt the production of nuclear weapons; it will not restrict their use in time of war."**

He said: **"This treaty is not the millennium. It will not resolve all conflicts, or cause the Communists to forgo their ambitions, or eliminate the dangers of war. It will not reduce our need for arms or allies or programs of assistance to others."**

He further indicated that the treaty would help the United States in maintaining its nuclear capabilities permanently, thus enabling it to carry on its policy of nuclear blackmail. "Under this limited treaty," he said, "on the other hand, the testing of other nations could never be sufficient to offset the ability of our strategic forces to deter or survive a nuclear attack and to penetrate and destroy an aggressor's homeland. We have, and under this treaty we will continue to have, all the nuclear strength that we need.

"It is true that the Soviets have tested nuclear weapons of a yield higher than that which we have thought to be necessary; but the hundred-megaton bomb of which they spoke two years

ago does not and will not change the balance of strategic power. **The United States has deliberately chosen to concentrate on more mobile and more efficient weapons, with lower but entirely sufficient yield. . . ."**

Kennedy said that "any nation which signs the treaty will have an opportunity to withdraw if it finds that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of the treaty have jeopardized its supreme interests; no nation's right to self-defence will in any way be impaired." This means that the United States may at any time resume its nuclear testing and even use nuclear weapons on the claim that its "supreme interests" have been jeopardized or that it is exercising its "right to self-defence."

On the other hand, Kennedy disclosed that the treaty was mainly aimed at preventing those socialist countries now having no nuclear arms from possessing nuclear defence capabilities. For the first time he named France as the fourth nuclear power in the hope of easing France's public opposition to a test ban. "This treaty," he said, "can be a step towards preventing the spread of nuclear weapons to nations not now possessing them. During the next several years, in addition to the four current nuclear powers, a small but significant number of nations will have the intellectual, physical and financial resources to produce both nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them. In time, it is estimated, many other nations will have either this capacity or other ways of obtaining nuclear warheads."

Preaching nuclear monopoly, Kennedy said: "I ask you to stop and think for a moment what it would mean to have nuclear weapons in many hands — in the hands of countries large and small, stable and unstable, responsible and irresponsible, scattered throughout the world. There would be no rest for anyone then, no stability, no real security, and no chance of effective disarmament. There would only be increased chances of accidental war, and an increased necessity

for the great powers to involve themselves in otherwise local conflicts."

Kennedy continued: "Neither the United States, nor the Soviet Union, nor the United Kingdom, nor France can look forward to that day with equanimity. **We have a great obligation** — all four nuclear powers have a great obligation — **to use whatever time remains to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, to persuade other countries not to test, transfer, acquire, possess or produce such weapons.**

"This treaty can be the opening wedge in that campaign. It provides that none of the parties will assist other nations to test in the forbidden environments. It opens the door for further agreements on the control of nuclear weapons. And it is open for all nations to sign."

Kennedy said he believed that the treaty "can limit the nuclear arms race in many ways, which, on balance, will strengthen our nation's security far more than the continuation of unrestricted testing."

The U.S. President expressed it as his opinion that the partial test ban treaty also helped the United States in making a "breakthrough" in East-West relations and would be a step towards "broader areas of agreement." **The United States,** he said, **was going "to seize this rare opportunity for progress."** If further agreements could be built on the foundations of this treaty, he continued, they could include controls on preparations for surprise attack, or on numbers and types of armaments. There could be further limitations on the spread of nuclear weapons. "The important point is that efforts to seek new agreement will go forward."

,Kennedy emphasized that "the Moscow talks reached no agreement on any other subject, nor is this treaty conditioned on any other matter. Under-Secretary Harriman made it clear that any non-aggression arrangements across the division in Europe would require full consultation with our allies and full attention to their interests."

Playing on the horror of nuclear war, Kennedy quoted Khrushchov's words to support his own statement. "A war today or tomorrow," he said, "if it led to nuclear war, would not be like any war in history. A full-scale nuclear exchange, lasting less than sixty minutes, could wipe out more than 300 million Americans, Europeans and Russians, as well as untold numbers elsewhere. And the survivors, as Chairman Khrushchov warned the Communist Chinese, 'would envy the dead'."

He stated that the treaty "can be a step toward freeing the world from the fears and dangers of radioactive fallout." But, as he himself had admitted, the United States conducted atmospheric nuclear tests only last year.

Kennedy admitted that "secret violations are possible, and secret preparations for a sudden withdrawal are possible. And thus **our own vigilance and strength must be maintained as we remain ready to withdraw and to resume all forms of testing, if we must."**

Nevertheless he sanctimoniously described the treaty as "a shaft of light (that) cut into the darkness" and "a step toward peace — a step toward reason — a step away from war," adding that "the path of peace may be open" and that the treaty "offers to all the world a welcome sign of hope." On the other hand, he did not hesitate to attack and vilify the socialist camp and the revolutionary movement of the peoples and call for a continuation of the arms drive and war preparations. "We have no illusions now that there are short cuts on the road to peace. At many points around the globe the Communists are continuing their efforts to exploit weakness and poverty. Their concentration of nuclear and conventional arms must still be deterred," he declared, and he added: "The familiar contest between choice and coercion, the familiar places of danger and conflict are still there — in Cuba, in Southeast Asia, in Berlin and all around the globe, still requiring all the strength and the vigilance that we can muster. **Nothing could more greatly damage our cause than if we and our allies**

were to believe that peace has already been achieved and that our strength and unity were no longer required."

Kennedy recalled that Prime Minister Macmillan joined with him in 1962 "in proposing a limited test ban treaty." He declared that the initialled treaty "is in part the product of Western patience and vigilance" and that "our soldiers and diplomats have worked together to this end." He said, "We have made clear — most recently in Berlin and in Cuba — our deep resolve to protect our security and our freedom against any threat or aggression."

STATEMENT OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT OF AUGUST 3, 1963 (Full Text)

The initialling in Moscow of the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water has been eagerly welcomed by the people everywhere. The Soviet government and its head, N. S. Khrushchov, have been receiving an endless stream of messages and telegrams from heads of state and government, prominent political and public personalities and ordinary men and women in all parts of the world, emphasizing the immense service the Soviet Union has rendered by its test-ban proposal, which was made the starting point of the successful Moscow negotiations. Expressed in these messages and telegrams is gratitude to the Soviet government for its wise, statesmanlike approach to one of the cardinal problems of our times. **A real step has been taken, a good start has been made,** towards settlement of international problems in keeping with the principles of peaceful co-existence. Many governments have already announced their intention to sign the treaty.

On July 31, the government of the Chinese People's Republic issued a statement on the results of the Moscow test-stoppage negotiations. In it, the C.P.R. government declares that it is opposed to the treaty and will not accede to it. The C.P.R. government even describes the treaty as a "fraud," alleging that it "dupes the peoples of the whole world" and "contradicts the aspirations of the peace-loving peoples of all countries."

The Soviet government considers it necessary, in this connection, to state the following.

The test-ban treaty is of fundamental importance for further exploration of ways and means of resolving the controversial questions that now divide the world. **The fact that states with differing social systems — and moreover Great Powers, whose contradictions have on more than one occasion threatened to plunge mankind into the abyss of world war — were able to work out a mutually acceptable solution for one of the most pressing international problems, is proof that the policy of peaceful co-existence is both correct and effective.** The peoples can see that there is a real possibility of easing international tension and halting the arms race, which imposes such a heavy burden upon them.

The results of the Moscow talks provide hope that outstanding international issues, upon which the strengthening of world peace depends, can be resolved. That is exactly what the Soviet government has been working for. **During the Moscow three-power negotiations it again presented a comprehensive programme of action for promoting peace.** It envisages a series of immediate steps to eliminate the menace of a thermonuclear conflict, **notably conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the Nato and Warsaw Treaty countries. Once again the Soviet government appealed for elimination of the survivals of World War II, conclusion of a German peace treaty and normalization, on that basis, of the position in West Berlin.**

The Soviet programme of strengthening peace accords with the vital interests of the peoples. It is warmly supported by the governments and peoples of the socialist states, by public opinion in Asia, Africa and Latin America, by millions of working people in the capitalist countries, by progressives the world over.

The collective opinion of the socialist countries on cessation of nuclear testing is set forth in the resolution of the meeting of First Central Committee Secretaries of Communist and Workers' Parties and Government Heads of the Warsaw Treaty states. "The achievement of agreement to ban nuclear

tests," the resolution says, "is a result of the consistent peaceable foreign policy of the Soviet Union and of all the socialist countries, a success for the Leninist policy of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems. The meeting is of opinion that this Treaty will help towards easing international tension and will be an asset in the struggle of the peoples for peace, against the danger of another world war."

Everywhere, on every continent, the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties have signified their complete approval of the treaty. They see in it a major result of the consistently pursued foreign policy of the Communist movement, aimed at strengthening the forces of peace and progress. Everyone concerned for peace approves the outcome of the Moscow talks. Against this background of unanimous approval, those who have ventured openly to oppose the treaty can be counted on the fingers of one hand. Nor is that surprising, for **he who today opposes prohibition of nuclear testing, no matter what verbal subtleties he resorts to, stands exposed as an enemy of the policy of peaceful co-existence, relaxation of international tension and of the undermining of the forces of aggression and war.**

The few days since the conclusion of the Moscow three-power talks have clearly shown who resents this new and important success of the peace forces. They are, primarily, the so-called "wild men" in the United States, who hold up the "Communist menace" bogey and clamorously complain that the treaty makes it impossible for the United States to devise weapons of still greater destructive power. They are the extremists among the West-German militarists and revanchists, who continue to plot fresh military gambles. They are the extremists among the French ruling element who, for some unknown reason, have decided that French grandeur lies not in assisting international détente or in friendship with other nations, but in friendship with the H-bomb and in building up a nuclear arsenal at any cost.

When such views are expressed by spokesmen of the most bellicose imperialist forces, no one is surprised. But when the test-ban treaty is opposed by Communists, and moreover Communists in the leadership of a socialist country, that is bound to rouse legitimate surprise. How can the leaders of a socialist country reject out of hand an international agreement that helps strengthen peace and accords with the peoples' aspirations and vital interests? **Only disregard of the fundamental interests of the peoples, who have long been demanding an end to nuclear explosions, could suggest the interpretation of the purpose and meaning of the treaty the Chinese government has sought to give in its statement.**

The statement claims that the purpose of the treaty is to "consolidate the nuclear monopoly" of the three powers, and that Soviet participation in such a treaty is "capitulation to American imperialism."

Nothing could be more absurd. In working for a test-ban treaty the Soviet Union, and all the peace forces, regarded it as an important step that would safeguard mankind from the dangerous consequences of radioactive contamination of the atmosphere, the water and outer space. And those who accuse the Soviet Union, lumping together a socialist power and capitalist powers, are seeking to present this as a desire by the Soviet Union to establish some sort of nuclear monopoly, even as "capitulation."

The inference, therefore, is that if nuclear weapons were disseminated throughout the world, if the way were open for putting them in the hands of the West-German revanchists, if there were one series after another of nuclear explosions conducted by dozens of countries — that would correspond to the interests of peace and would not constitute capitulation to imperialism. But that is the opposite of the truth. **This would be irresponsible playing with the destiny of millions upon millions of people. Everyone eager to safeguard the present and future of his people, and promote peace not only in words but in deeds, is fully aware of that.**

The C.P.R. government tries to cancel out facts known to the whole world. **That its attempts to cast aspersion on the Soviet attitude on nuclear weapons are unfounded, is evident from the fact alone that, way back in 1946, the Soviet Union was the first to propose permanent prohibition of nuclear weapons and destruction of their stockpiles.** Though it has the most advanced nuclear weapons and the most efficient means of delivery, the Soviet Union has for many years worked perseveringly and consistently to secure prohibition of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, discontinuance of their production, destruction of all stockpiles, cessation of all testing and the break-up of national war machines.

At the U.N. General Assembly in 1959, the head of the Soviet government, N. S. Khrushchov, proposed general and complete disarmament, and that proposal became the peoples' banner in the fight for lasting peace. Prohibition and complete destruction of all nuclear weapons and of all means of delivery forms the basis, the backbone, of the Soviet disarmament programme. It is generally known that the Soviet government is also urging such immediate measures to restrict the nuclear arms race as denuclearized zones in various parts of the world and closure of military bases on foreign territory.

Can it be said that in proposing these measures the Soviet Union is guided solely by its own interests, and not by the interests, also, of the entire socialist community and of all the peoples? **And is it not a fact that what the C.P.R. government's statement describes as a nuclear monopoly, i.e., Soviet possession of nuclear weapons, played a definite, it might even be said, decisive, part in safeguarding the socialist countries, the C.P.R. included, against becoming the target of imperialist aggression and enabling them victoriously to build socialism and communism?**

The Chinese government's statement further asserts that the test-ban treaty does not fully solve the problem of banning all types of nuclear weapons, discontinuing their production and destroying nuclear stockpiles. There is no denying that

the treaty does not solve all these problems. And it should be clear to everyone that the wider the scope of a treaty, the better. The ideal solution would be immediately to conclude a treaty on general and complete disarmament. We have been urging that all along. **Perhaps the Chinese leaders know the secret of how to solve this problem at one stroke? As for us, we believe that it is better to do something than to do nothing, when agreement on a partial measure is in the interests of peace and socialism. If in present-day conditions, we cannot yet solve the problem immediately and fully, the only sensible method is to solve it step by step. And one must lose all sense of reality to pose the alternative "all or nothing" in matters that involve the destinies of the world and the lives of millions of people.**

It is easy enough to bandy about the simple formula "all or nothing." But that demand has no real practical meaning. Can that approach to international affairs be considered realistic? It is the duty of Communists, and primarily of Communists entrusted with state leadership, to secure — even if this has to be done step by step — a situation in which the peoples will be free of the menace of nuclear war and destruction. The Soviet government is convinced that in no country in the world will the people put the seal of approval to a policy that condemns them to breathe radioactive air, nor will they approve of plans for a frenzied nuclear arms race, or the acquisition of nuclear weapons by the most adventuristic forces of the imperialist camp, including the West-German revanchists. No people will consent to that.

Only those can object to the test-ban treaty who hold aloof from the people's struggle against nuclear war and use flamboyant phrases in favour of the most radical disarmament measures to conceal their lack of desire or readiness to work for disarmament. Objections can come only from men who regard the struggle for general and complete disarmament as outsiders and do not cherish every real success in the battle for peace. Conversely, those who are waging that struggle

prize every step towards this great goal. Incidentally, the Chinese leaders find themselves obliged to admit, in their statement, that there must be a "gradual" advance to complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. But if that approach is accepted — and there is no other in present-day conditions — then why should the Soviet Union be reproached with failing to secure immediate solution of the whole problem?

Carried away by their polemics, the Chinese leaders apparently believe that in this case they are not bound by logic. The C.P.R. government's statement affirms, on the one hand, that the test-ban treaty will give the peoples nothing, since it does not provide for complete prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons. On the other hand, however, the statement alleges that the treaty is a bad one because it does not extend to underground tests. In other words, the Chinese government, too, accepts the principle that cessation of nuclear weapon testing is a useful development and is demanded by the peoples. But only a few lines later the C.P.R. government's statement adduces a series of artificial arguments against the treaty, alleging, for instance, that it is a "fraud," inasmuch as it does not fully solve the problem of abolishing nuclear weapons.

A nuclear test-ban treaty, even if it were to extend to underground tests, is, of course, only a partial measure, only a step towards disarmament, a step that creates more favourable conditions for achieving disarmament. But it might be asked: **Does it facilitate or impede solution of the paramount problem of disarmament? With the exception of the most arrant imperialist foes of peace, everyone admits that agreement to halt nuclear testing creates more favourable requisites for progress in disarmament.** Communists in the capitalist countries, the Communist parties at the head of the socialist countries, reply to that question in the affirmative: conclusion of a treaty banning nuclear tests helps the struggle for general and complete disarmament. But the C.P.R. government maintains the very opposite. It would appear that

the whole world is in error and that only the C.P.R. government sees the truth.

Who, then, is really deceiving the peoples? Those who, having achieved the first real results, urge further progress and intensified effort in the battle against the aggressive forces of imperialism, in the battle to settle other major issues, or those who disparage the efforts and successes of the peace supporters and thereby disorient the peoples and sow disbelief in their ability to prevent war?

The whole conception advanced by the C.P.R. government is imbued with hopelessness and pessimism. Coming from those who are doomed by history and feel the ground slipping from under their feet, that "neck or nothing" conception might be understandable. But one fails to understand how it could be advanced by the government of a country building socialist society.

Who can be inspired by this pessimistic conception? The people draw strength not from the belief that they are steadily moving towards the black abyss of thermonuclear war, but from faith in their ability, and the possibility, to bridle the forces of war and bring the world genuine peace and progress.

The C.P.R. government alleges that the test-ban treaty will lead to "American imperialism winning military superiority," whereas the peaceable nations, including China, are being denied "the possibility to strengthen their defence might."

Strange logic! Even our enemies find themselves compelled to admit that the Soviet Union now has the world's most powerful nuclear weapons and the most efficient means of delivering them to any target. **This formidable missile and nuclear shield safeguards not only the security of the Soviet Union, but also the security of all the socialist countries, including the C.P.R., and serves as a mainstay of world peace.**

Does the test-ban treaty alter the present balance of strength? No. The Soviet government would never consent to a treaty that placed it in an unequal position and gave the

other side unilateral advantages. All that does not require special proof.

Lastly, if the question is posed of who benefits most from the treaty, would it not be more correct to assume that **the Soviet Union, as the nuclear power of the socialist community, is in a better position to judge, in the matter of nuclear explosions, whether or not the balance of strength is being altered, and if it is, in what direction. Is not the C.P.R. government taking too much upon itself in drawing conclusions, in this matter, for the Soviet government and the Soviet Union?**

No, the C.P.R. government's statement is not animated by concern for the socialist community's defence capacity. It is apparently motivated by a desire — in total disregard of the attitude of the socialist camp and of all the peace forces — to pursue its own special policy on the question of what to do about nuclear weapons, the most destructive weapons known, whether to destroy them or open the sluice gates to their unhindered dissemination throughout the world.

The Chinese leaders should have pondered on the fact that **by refusing to sign the test-ban treaty they find themselves in the company of its imperialist opponents. No one can convince the Soviet government that that attitude is in the interests of any people, whether in Europe or America, Asia or Africa, whether of a small country or big.**

The C.P.R. government evidently realizes that a negative stand on the peace and disarmament issue is highly unpopular in our time. That is why it endeavours, in its statement, **to make out that it has its "own" programme on nuclear disarmament, a programme even more radical than the one advanced by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.**

But first, **this "programme," formulated in the C.P.R. government's statement, contains nothing new. All the proposals it enumerates were at one or another time advanced by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The C.P.R. government has only repeated them.** The whole world knows that

the Soviet Union and other socialist states continue to wage an active struggle, in alliance with the world's peace forces, for implementation of their programme of general and complete disarmament, which includes also complete destruction of nuclear weapons.

Second, **the substance of the C.P.R. government's statement lies not in its radical programme, which lists proposals made a long time ago by other countries, but in the attempt to use this programme as a cover for refusal to sign the test-ban treaty.**

The Chinese government has not a single convincing argument to support its negative attitude towards the test-ban treaty. Nor can any government that bases its policy wholly on the interests of peace and socialism, on the interests of the peoples, have any such arguments.

Shoulder to shoulder with the other socialist countries, the Soviet Union continues its unremitting efforts for general and complete disarmament. The Soviet government always appreciated in the past that **the C.P.R. marched in the same ranks and contributed to the struggle for disarmament and durable peace among the nations.**

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries regard **the C.P.R. government's statement as an unprecedented and most deplorable act.**

All friends of peace and socialism cannot but regret that the government of a socialist country has, on an issue involving the vital interests of all the peoples of the world, taken a step which stands in gross contradiction to the common international policy of the socialist states, in gross contradiction to the basic principles by which these states are guided in their foreign policy, and which twice — in 1957 and 1960 — were undersigned by the C.P.R. leaders. **The C.P.R. government's attitude is at variance with the Leninist policy of peaceful co-existence of states with differing social systems. The Chinese leaders are thus openly counterposing themselves to the socialist commonwealth, to the entire world Communist movement, to all the peaceable nations of Europe, Asia, Africa and America.**

The Chinese government cannot but realize that having taken this path, it is causing direct damage to the unity of the socialist camp and weakening the united front of struggle against imperialism. Such actions can only bring joy to the enemies of peace, whose cherished aim is to disunite the socialist countries, set them at loggerheads, destroy the great unity of the socialist commonwealth and undermine the socialist world system from within.

Nor should the fact be overlooked that **the Chinese government's statement, with its attacks on the Soviet Union and its policy, is one more demonstration that the Chinese leaders are carrying ideological differences to relations between states.** For there is no other explanation to the appearance in their statement of impudent allegations that, by concluding the nuclear test-ban treaty, the Soviet government has "betrayed the interests of the Soviet people, betrayed the interests of the peoples of the countries of the socialist camp, China included, betrayed the interests of the peaceable nations of the whole world."

It is hard to say what predominates here, political irresponsibility or the irritation of men who see their designs foiled by life itself.

Who authorized the C.P.R. government to speak on behalf of and for the Soviet people? Who asked it to speak for the peoples of the other socialist countries? It looks as if the authors of the statement are nervous — flouting the elementary standards of international intercourse, not to mention the standards of relations between fraternal socialist countries, their statement tries to oppose the Soviet people to their government. Even the imperialists long ago realized the futility of such attempts. In the years of intervention and subsequently in World War II, they broke their teeth on the monolithic unity of the Soviet people behind their government and glorious Communist Party. The people voted with

their blood and life for Soviet power in their country, for the policy of their Communist party and their Soviet government. And now, too, by their splendid achievements in building communism the Soviet people are voting approval of their government's peace policy and expressing their boundless support of, and faith in, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its Central Committee.

But the Chinese leaders, in whose footsteps are they following? **One will not find in the C.P.R. government's statement, even with the help of a microscope, an iota of respect for the Soviet Union's sovereignty. Yet Communists, and the socialist countries, should not only proclaim but consistently uphold in international relations, including relations between socialist countries, the principle of sovereignty and non-interference in internal affairs. If the government of a socialist state contemptuously disregards sovereignty and stoops to insulting attacks on fraternal countries and peoples, what can one oppose to the imperialist policy of trampling upon the sovereign right of nations?**

Only men who have sealed themselves off by a wall of dogmatic conceptions from everything that agitates mankind, from the concerns and hopes of the working people — only such men can fail to see, or pretend not to see, the vast changes that are taking place on our planet and display disbelief in the judgment and will of the peoples, who in our day are capable of preventing a world thermonuclear war.

The C.P.R. government tries to seek out contradictions in the Soviet Union's attitude. But, artificially lining up quotations and juggling with words, it forgets the simple truth that life is not stagnant. Science and technology are rapidly developing. And what was unacceptable only yesterday can prove useful, even very useful, today.

That applies to the ban on nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. There can be no room for doubt about **who is more competent to pass judgment on this matter — those who possess and are testing nuclear weapons,**

or those who know about nuclear weapons only from literature. There can be no two opinions on that score.

As for the C.P.R. government's proposal to hold an international conference of heads of government to discuss disarmament and other problems, the Soviet government cannot, of course, object to that, since this is its own proposal, one of the proposals the Soviet government has repeatedly advanced. And in making this proposal we proceeded from the understanding — and said so — that **obligations for the Chinese People's Republic can be assumed only by its government, and, consequently, China's obligations can be discussed only with the participation of the C.P.R. government.** The Soviet government continues firmly to adhere to that position.

The question arises, in this connection, of why the C.P.R. government found it necessary to bring out, precisely now, the proposal for an international conference to discuss disarmament and a number of other international problems, and to claim that this is a new development? **It did so, in this case too, to cover up its refusal to sign the test-ban treaty.**

Anxious to discredit the indisputable achievements in the struggle to diminish the menace of war, and to discredit the Soviet Union's peace policy, the Chinese leaders have revealed to the world that **their policy leads to aggravation of international tension, continued intensification of the nuclear arms drive, to the steady expansion of its sphere and scope. That attitude is tantamount to factual connivance with those who want a global thermonuclear war and oppose negotiated settlement of international issues.** There need be no doubt that this attitude will meet, is already meeting, with trenchant condemnation by the people of the socialist countries and of all peaceable states, by everyone who cherishes peace and progress.

Expressing the will of the entire Soviet people, **the Soviet government rejects the fabrications about its foreign policy contained in the C.P.R. government's statement.** No inventions and no attacks can change Soviet foreign policy, given

us by the great Lenin, further developed in the decisions of our Party's Twentieth and Twenty-second Congresses and in the CPSU Programme, and unanimously endorsed by the Soviet people and the international Communist movement. Guided by that policy, the Soviet Union will continue unswervingly to follow its course of peace and friendship among the nations, to work for general and complete disarmament, peaceful settlement of international issues, including European security, and for the triumph of the Leninist principles of peaceful co-existence.

It stands to reason that the Soviet government would sincerely welcome a C.P.R. foreign policy based on unity of the socialist states, who are fighting to remove the menace of thermonuclear war, for peaceful co-existence, for the freedom of all nations and for their right to build their life as they see fit. That is required by the interests of international Communist solidarity, by the interests of socialism and communism, by the interests of peace.

STATEMENT OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT OF AUGUST 21, 1963 (Full Text)

Less than a month has passed since the day the Governments of the USSR, the United States and Britain signed in Moscow the Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water. But even within this short space of time the attitude of the peoples and governments to the Treaty has become clear: the day it was signed, August 5, 1963, is impressed on the minds of all who value peace as a date when the fruits of the policy of peaceful coexistence, of efforts aimed at preventing a new world war, became more tangible.

For the first time in many years overshadowed by the cold war, **the states of the East and the West have managed to reach agreement on a burning international issue involving the vital interests of the entire population of the Earth.** For the first time an issue concerning the most devastating weapon that ever threatened mankind has become the subject of agreement. And for the first time an international agreement initially worked out by three nuclear powers has met such a mighty response and support in all parts of our planet. All continents have become the scene of a referendum, as it were, and its results are already known: the peoples of the world have taken a firm stand in support of the Treaty.

The majority of states, differing in their political and social systems, sometimes holding opposing world outlooks, have proclaimed their support for or have already affixed their signatures to the Treaty. Despite all the differences separating them, they are united in one thing: in the striving to put

an end to the contamination of the Earth's atmosphere and at the same time to lay the foundation for further steps towards reducing international tension and towards diminishing the danger of the outbreak of a thermonuclear war.

The universal approval shown by the peoples for the nuclear test ban Treaty has at the same time demonstrated the pitiable isolation in which the enemies of the Treaty have found themselves. Even among those who at first started back at the very mention of the possibility of ending nuclear tests, there are now governments and statesmen who are beginning to reform their positions as they go along. For example, **the FRG Government decided to sign the Treaty, and has already done so. Apparently it realised after all that there are limits beyond which you cannot go if you do not want to show the whole world that your policy is contrary to the vital interests of the peoples. Chancellor Adenauer, who even in Western countries has won unenviable reputation as one of the last Mohicans of the cold war, decided, under pressure of circumstances and of world public opinion, that it is better to stop openly opposing the nuclear test ban Treaty.**

But the PRC leaders, covering up with pseudo-revolutionary phrases, continue pouring pailfuls of slander on this Treaty which expresses the hopes of the peoples.

As early as on the eve of the signing of the Treaty the leaders of the People's Republic of China attempted to turn world public opinion against its signing. On July 31, 1963, they addressed a statement to the governments of all countries of the world, the essence of which, besides slanderous attacks on the Soviet Union and its peaceful foreign policy, was to "prove" to all and sundry that this Treaty was a "trap" and "fraud", that it contradicted the interests of the peoples and the interests of peace. Today the Chinese leaders can themselves judge how this stand of the PRC Government has been evaluated by the world. A bare examination of the list of states that have signed the Treaty speaks for itself. And more and more signatures of the representatives of countries of

Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America are appearing under the text of the Treaty every day.

One would think that this would be food for serious thought, one would think that in Peking too they would understand the meaning of this response from the states and the peoples to the attempts of the Chinese Government to torpedo the nuclear test ban Treaty. It goes without saying that the PRC Government, like the government of any other country, is free to decide its attitude — favourable or unfavourable — to the Treaty, whether to accede to it or not. However, **if no special purposes were being pursued, purposes having, perhaps, no direct bearing on the given Treaty, it would be enough simply to refuse to sign the Treaty and let matters rest at that. But apparently the point is that the conclusion of the nuclear test ban Treaty did not merely cause a fit of vexation and political nervousness among the Chinese leaders, but that they also want to use this major event of international life to try and impose on other countries, by means of fabrications and low tricks, their adventuristic stand on the fundamental issues of war and peace.** Only this can explain the fact that on August 15 one more batch of slander directed against the nuclear test ban Treaty and against the foreign policy of the USSR came from Peking, this time in the form of a statement by a PRC Government spokesman.

Anyone who takes an objective view of the world situation will easily see that this move, hostile to the cause of peace and socialism, cannot drown the calm and confident voice of the peoples expressing their satisfaction at the success of the peaceloving forces which for many years have been waging an unrelenting struggle for the cessation of nuclear tests, for disarmament, for peace and international friendship. If the new Chinese statement proves anything, it is only that **the PRC Government, in its attitude to the test ban Treaty, not only joins hands with the most aggressive-minded circles of the imperialist powers but even assumes the role of those in the extreme right wing of the ranks of the American "mad-**

men", the West German revenge-seekers, and the French extremists.

Properly speaking, the statement of the Chinese Government spokesman in actual fact adds little to what has already been said by the PRC Government in its statement of July 31, to which the Soviet Government has already replied on August 3. Like the previous one, the new Chinese statement shows that **the PRC leadership only pays lip-service to the policy approved by the international communist movement at the meetings of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1957 and 1960, the policy of peaceful coexistence, of reducing international tension and strengthening peace among the peoples, while in practice it sabotages efforts to implement this common policy of the countries of the socialist community and of the world communist movement.**

It seems as if all the invectives in the Chinese language have migrated from the pages of **the Chinese press, which is waging a rampant anti-Soviet campaign,** to the official documents of the PRC Government. "Shame", "plot", "treachery" — what words do the Chinese leaders not use against the country to which, as they themselves have repeatedly admitted, the Chinese people owe a lot. It is quite natural therefore that because of their slanderous and hostile attitude to the Soviet Union neither statement of the PRC Government was accepted by the USSR Embassy in the PRC for presentation to the Soviet Government, and that both were returned to the senders, the PRC Government.

It is hard, or to be more accurate it is impossible, to detect in the statement of the spokesman of the Chinese Government any well-grounded, serious arguments, or any objective statement of facts.

The new Chinese statement is full of the old assertions that the nuclear test ban Treaty "is advantageous to the forces of war and disadvantageous to the forces struggling for peace", that it is "a capitulation to American imperialism", and that it is aimed at consolidating the "nuclear monopoly" of certain

powers, etc. It goes without saying that these unwarranted assertions do not become more convincing for being endlessly repeated. That is why the Soviet Government does not see any need to start a new detailed study of all these trumped-up assertions and stilted arguments being advanced by the Chinese Government against the Treaty. Their untenability has already been proved in the Soviet Government's statement of August 3.

For example, the Chinese leaders are again contending that "the danger of war has increased" as a result of the signing of the nuclear test ban Treaty. What does this assertion mean? If they had said that the Treaty does not eliminate the danger of war, they would be right. The Soviet Government said this during the signing of the Treaty and stressed that of course this Treaty does not and cannot eliminate the danger of war, although it does open new and more favourable opportunities for developing the struggle to strengthen peace. But the Chinese leaders are asserting something entirely different. They want to prove that as a result of the signing of the nuclear test ban Treaty the danger of war has increased, has become greater than it was before the signing. It appears that the whole world is wrong in its estimation of the significance of the nuclear test ban Treaty, and that **only the Chinese leaders have the key to wisdom.** One can only say that this is very strange wisdom, characteristic only of those **who think it is possible to sit on some Olympus and utter truths from there which have nothing in common with real life, and to guide their actions by the belief that if life does not fit into their dead schemes, then so much the worse for life.**

But how do the Chinese leaders support their assertion that the Treaty on the banning of nuclear tests increases the threat of war? To believe them one would think that the continuation and expansion of nuclear weapon tests, the creation of ever more deadly types of these weapons, the emergence of a situation in which **these weapons would be spread all over the world and the West German revanchists would begin producing**

them tomorrow and the day after perhaps the Chiang Kai-shek clique would also do so — and there might be people willing to help them — all this would contribute to the cause of strengthening peace.

The authors of the new Chinese statement go so far as to state: if there were no nuclear test ban Treaty, there would be no tests either, because the Government of the United States would, if you please, hardly have dared to resume them "light-mindedly". But this is utterly absurd. Such a claim is tantamount to an attempt to persuade people that there would be no violations of law if states did not pass laws. It is also strange that the Chinese leaders have taken it upon themselves to speak for the United States Government about its intentions concerning the holding of nuclear tests.

Realising, evidently that all their statements concerning the increase of the danger of war as a result of the ending of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water can only make the people doubt the ability of the Chinese leaders to assess the meaning of their own words, they have advanced one more "argument", which, to all appearances, they believe would save their positions: the Treaty, they say, does not forbid the United States of America to hold underground nuclear tests or to increase its stockpiles of nuclear weapons. But firstly, the hands of the United States were not bound in this respect before the signing of the Treaty either, so nothing new has happened in this sense. And secondly, the Treaty does not forbid the Soviet Union either, if need be, to hold underground nuclear tests, to increase its stockpiles of nuclear arms, and even to use these weapons against the imperialist aggressors if they should unleash a war in a fit of insanity. The situation is the same here, and the Chinese leaders know as well as the leading statesmen of the United States that we Soviet people are not simpletons, either, and that having concluded the nuclear test ban Treaty the Soviet Union does not intend to disarm unilaterally in the face of imperialism.

What gullible people are supposed to be convinced by the statement of the Chinese leaders about "capitulation" to American imperialism, about the alleged "fraud" of the Treaty on the banning of nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water? There are no such gullible people in our time; the peoples have long ago learnt to distinguish truth from slander.

The leaders of the Government of the People's Republic of China are striving to prove that if the Soviet Government earlier held one stand on the question of banning nuclear weapon tests — and they are generously prepared to regard it as correct — and then adopted a different viewpoint, this is some kind of mortal sin and almost a treachery.

Yes, **the Soviet Union's position on the question of ending nuclear weapon tests was not fossilised, it conformed to the changes in the balance of forces in the international arena, to the successes in the strengthening of the defence potential of the USSR and of all the countries of the socialist community, and took into account all that in its entirety is called the realities of the nuclear age.**

In the first years after the appearance of nuclear weapons in the arsenal of the United States, when the United States had a nuclear monopoly, and the security of the socialist countries was endangered, the Soviet Government considered that the main task was to deprive the United States of that advantage. This aim could be achieved either by completely banning nuclear weapons, which would have meant taking these weapons away from the only nuclear power at that time, the United States, or by developing our own nuclear weapons to help ensure the security of all the socialist countries. It was then that the Soviet Government advanced its demand for the banning and destruction of nuclear weapons and, when this demand was rejected by the Western powers, it started to develop its own nuclear weapons, which were to become a good additional guarantee of the independence and security of all the countries of the socialist community and to make

the imperialists lose their taste for aggression against the socialist states. Naturally the banning of nuclear weapon tests without the simultaneous destruction of the weapons in the possession of the United States would not have been in the interests of the socialist states at that time: it would have brought to a halt the work on the development of nuclear weapons in the Soviet Union, and perpetuated the American nuclear monopoly.

But the situation did not remain unchanged. As a result of the intensive efforts of the Soviet people and of Soviet scientists to develop our own nuclear weapons, the American nuclear monopoly was smashed, the world socialist system received its own nuclear shield and the imperialist powers lost the material basis for conducting a policy of nuclear blackmail, "positions-of-strength" policy vis-a-vis the socialist countries. This put also the question of a nuclear weapon test ban in a new perspective. The continuation of nuclear testing could now only lead the spiral of the nuclear arms race higher and higher, in which the socialist countries and all other peaceloving states are not interested. At the same time, **with the new balance of forces a nuclear test ban would seal not the American nuclear monopoly but the fact of its liquidation, not the unilateral advantage of the imperialist camp but the new balance of strength in the sphere of nuclear weapons.**

Taking all these circumstances into consideration and continuing to wage a persistent struggle for disarmament and for the complete prohibition and liquidation of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Government at the same time advanced in 1956 a proposal for an agreement on the ending of nuclear tests without waiting for a settlement of the disarmament problem. In the changed conditions this stand was just as correct and met the interests of the socialist states and the interests of peace to the same extent as the previous stand at the previous stage.

It is also necessary to stress that the proposal then advanced by the Soviet Government on the prohibition of nuclear weapon

tests envisaged the settling of this question on exactly the same basis on which this question has now been settled. At that time nuclear tests were held only in the atmosphere and under water, there were no tests in other environments, and it was a question of banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere and under water. In the Treaty signed on August 5 the banning of nuclear weapon tests in a third environment, outer space, was added to this. The difference is thus that **in 1956 the United States refused to accept our proposal and in 1963 it accepted it in an even more extensive form, with the addition of outer space.**

As to underground nuclear tests, the question of these did not arise in 1956 — at that time no such tests were held — but later, when the United States began carrying out underground nuclear weapon tests. Naturally the Soviet Government began from then on to press also for the prohibition of underground nuclear tests. However, it has not yet been proved possible to reach agreement on this because the Western powers linked the prohibition of underground nuclear tests with the setting up of so-called international control, actually international espionage, which could involve the security interests of the socialist states and to which the Soviet Government could not naturally agree.

In view of the prevailing situation the Soviet Union and the world as a whole had to choose between the banning of nuclear weapon tests in three environments and the continuation of an unbridled and unrestricted tests race. And if today it proved possible to reach agreement on the banning of tests in three media, thereby solving the most important part of the entire problem, this is a big success for the peoples, a victory for the peaceloving forces, a concrete achievement of the policy of peace.

These are the main landmarks of the principled and at the same time flexible and realistic policy of the Soviet Union on the question of banning nuclear weapon tests. In whatever way the international situation changed, this policy met not

only the interests of the Soviet Union but also the interests of all the socialist and all the peaceloving states, just as the result achieved through this policy — the conclusion of the Treaty on the banning of nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water — meets their most cherished interests.

Neither can those who oppose the ending of nuclear tests, and in whose company the Chinese leaders have now placed themselves, make political capital by seeking some sort of contradiction in the fact that a year or two ago the Soviet Government did not deem it possible to accept a partial solution of the test ban question and that it has now agreed to the conclusion of a treaty banning tests in three environments. The Chinese leaders pretend to be especially surprised by the fact that **only a month or six weeks before the opening of the three-power talks in Moscow the Soviet Government continued to press for the conclusion of a treaty banning all nuclear weapon tests. But every sober-minded politician or diplomat realises that each side wishes to achieve the maximum in negotiating with its partners.** We strove for this maximum, that is for the ending of all nuclear weapon tests, including underground testing. But **at the present stage this proved impossible. And in these conditions the Soviet Union consented to an agreement on the banning of nuclear tests in three environments: in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. This was a step that met the expectations of world public opinion,** a step dictated by concern for the health of the Soviet people and for the health of all other peoples, including the Chinese people. It is precisely in these three media, after all, that nuclear weapon tests harm people's health and contaminate the world's animal and plant life with radioactive fall-out. Of course, the Soviet Government has not now given up its efforts in the struggle to ban underground nuclear weapon tests as well.

The Soviet Government has already called the attention of the PRC Government to the simple truth that **life does not stand still, that science and technology are developing tempestuously, and that something which was unacceptable yesterday may turn out to be useful, even very useful, today.** Underlying this are definite material factors of great significance, connected with the important and major steps taken by the Soviet Government to strengthen the defence capacity of the USSR and the security of all the socialist countries. These steps, which included tests of the latest types of nuclear weapons, among them the most powerful ones in the world, reliably ensured the security of the socialist community. We now possess all the necessary requisites for continuing to maintain our defence potential at the proper level required or liable to be required by the situation.

And when we speak about this we do so knowing the facts of the matter. **For fifteen years now the Soviet Government has had dealings with nuclear weapons, and we are familiar with all aspects of the question.** It is true that the Chinese leaders are trying to question this, claiming evidently to have opinions of their own on matters involving nuclear weapons. But **when those who have only a second-hand acquaintance with nuclear weapons begin to pass judgement on the matter, they naturally put themselves willy-nilly in an embarrassing position.** Incidentally this also applies to the flippant pronouncements of the Chinese leaders on strategic nuclear weapons, on tactical nuclear weapons, on whether the United States needs or does not need to continue atmospheric nuclear tests, and on other such questions. **To speak about this without being sufficiently well-informed is rather risky. And the point is not that someone wants to monopolise the right to speak about nuclear weapons and to deprive others of this right; the point is whose pronouncements on this question carry weight and whose sound like empty prattle.**

Of course we cannot now divulge such things as, for instance, the concrete results of the nuclear weapon tests we carried out in 1961-62, information on the calibres of the nuclear warheads in our arsenal, the purpose of specific nu-

clear combat devices of which the Soviet Union has an abundance, where these combat devices are deployed, and so forth. That would be against the security interests of the Soviet Union and of all the socialist states, including the security interests of the People's Republic of China.

And if the Chinese leaders, in saying that in recent years the situation has not changed but the USSR policy on a test ban has, thus try in a way to provoke the Soviet Union to demonstrate clearly the changes in the balance of nuclear strength in recent years and for this purpose to divulge the defence secrets of the USSR, we can tell them one thing only: **while you are talking about your concern to strengthen the defence of the socialist countries, you are in actual fact playing the role of those who do not cherish the security interests of the socialist community but are ready to play into the hands of the forces of imperialist reaction.** The Chinese leaders cannot be unaware of the fact that obtaining really reliable information on Soviet nuclear and missile weapons is exactly what the military staffs of certain powers and aggressive military blocs dream of.

If for some reason the Chinese Government really has doubts about whether the Soviet Union has the powerful nuclear weapons necessary to defend all the socialist states, and is not satisfied with our explanations on this matter it could at least turn its attention to the statements made by high-ranking military leaders in the United States only several days ago in the US Congress, including the statement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States. These statements unequivocally admit the nuclear might now possessed by the Soviet Union. They mean a lot, especially if one takes into consideration the fact that the imperialists only admit the achievements of socialist countries when they are compelled to do so by life itself.

Such is the Soviet Government's stand on the question of banning nuclear weapon tests. It is a frank and honest stand, and we note with great satisfaction that it meets with the full

understanding and support of the other socialist states and of all peaceloving states and peoples. The strength of our position lies in its vitality, in its full accord with the cardinal interests of the peoples, in its realistic outlook, in the fact that it takes into account the changes that have taken place in recent years and are taking place now in the world arena.

It is regrettable that **in Peking they not only do not take into account the changes that are shaping the outlook of the modern world, but regard it as the ideal of statesmanship unflaggingly to follow frigid dogmas in politics and to counterpose the dead letter to the living reality.** Herein lies the main failure of the policy of the Chinese leaders, in particular on the question of banning nuclear weapon tests.

It follows from the August 15 statement of the PRC Government spokesman that **the Chinese leaders are greatly displeased with the Soviet Union because it did not give China samples of atomic weapons. It looks as if it is precisely this annoyance at the policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states not to spread nuclear weapons that is motivating the attacks of the PRC leaders on the Soviet foreign policy measures aimed at lessening international tension and consolidating peace, and especially their attacks on the nuclear test ban Treaty.**

The Soviet Government has already more than once taken steps to convince the PRC Government that preventing the spread of nuclear weapons is in the interests of peace, and the interests of all socialist countries, including the Chinese People's Republic. The course of history was such that the Soviet Union is the only socialist country manufacturing nuclear weapons. **By its entire foreign policy the Soviet Union has demonstrated that its nuclear might reliably protects the interests of the world socialist community, the interests of the peoples fighting for their social and national liberation. If there were one or several more socialist countries among the nuclear states this would, of course, make no substantial difference to the defence potential of the socialist camp** if, of course, the socialist camp is to be considered as a single entity.

But **with each new capitalist state that gets possession of nuclear weapons, the danger of a nuclear war will increase. The possibility of the number of socialist nuclear powers increasing while the number of nuclear states in the imperialist camp remains the same is out of the question, and to build one's calculations on this would mean building them on sand.**

It would be naive, to say the least, to think that it is possible to have one policy for the West and another for the East, to fight with one hand against the arming of West Germany with nuclear weapons, against the spreading of nuclear weapons throughout the world, and with the other to hand these weapons over to China.

No, that would be an unrealistic policy, a policy divorced from life. If the socialist countries had taken such a course towards which they are persistently pushed by the Chinese leaders, the Western nuclear powers would beyond all doubt have replied in kind, and it is a fact that a number of capitalist states have the economic, technical and other means to produce nuclear weapons. This entire nuclear arsenal would have gone into the common pool of the aggressive military blocs of NATO, CENTO, SEATO, and have opposed the nuclear arsenal of the socialist countries. Only people blinded by their craving to have nuclear weapons in their own hands can fail to see and realise this.

The efforts of the Soviet Union to secure an international agreement banning the spread of nuclear weapons meet the widest response and support the world over just because the Soviet Union **holds a position of principle** on this issue. Were it not for the consistent and resolute struggle of the Soviet Union against the spreading of nuclear weapons, a struggle backed by its nuclear might, the militaristic forces in the West, and above all the West German revenge-seekers who are making an all-out effort to get hold of nuclear weapons, would have been much closer to their goal than they actually are now.

We have criticised and still criticise the policy of the Government of the United States and other Western powers because it holds open the door for the nuclear arming of West Germany, at least in common with other NATO countries. The Soviet Government has come out firmly against the plans for "NATO multilateral nuclear force", having unconditionally denounced those plans and taken appropriate foreign policy actions to demonstrate to the peoples their danger if they were realised. This was done by the Government of the Soviet Union and not by the Government of the People's Republic of China. The Soviet Government has exposed and will continue to expose the false conception upheld by the NATO powers that it is better if West Germany receives access to nuclear arms under NATO control, in the framework of the joint nuclear force of that military bloc, than if she develops her own nuclear weapons. The Soviet Government puts the matter differently: the nuclear arming of West Germany must not be allowed in any form, because providing these weapons to a state whose foreign policy is based on revanchism, on a revision of existing national frontiers in Europe, would greatly increase the danger of a new world war. This is why the Soviet Government will not relax its efforts to convince the Western powers as well that the policy of spreading nuclear arms, providing for their transfer in any form to West Germany, is deeply erroneous and fraught with great danger for peace.

One might think that **the Chinese leaders, having shut themselves off from all the world by some sort of blinkers, know nothing of this and have not heard about it.** For they claim in their statement, contrary to facts well known to everybody who reads newspapers and listens to the radio, that **the Soviet Union does not really oppose the possession of nuclear arms by the West German militarists. This cannot be regarded as anything but slander.**

The standpoint of the PRC Government set forth also in the statement of August 15 can only be understood to mean that **the Chinese leaders do not care how nuclear weapons**

will spread among the capitalist countries as long as the PRC leaders have a chance to sample a nuclear bomb and see what it is like.

One must admit that **being at a definite stage of its economic development, possessing a definite economic potential, the PRC is as yet unprepared to produce nuclear arms in quantities. Even if the PRC were to produce two or three bombs, this would still not solve the problem for it, but would result in a great strain on the PRC's economy. We know from our own experience what it costs a country, a people to produce nuclear arms on a large scale, on a level matching modern military techniques and modern defence requirements.** But we were compelled to do this in order to be able to resist the imperialist camp which possessed such arms. **And the People's Republic of China can now rely on the defence potential which has been developed by the efforts of the Soviet people and which reliably serves to defend the countries of the socialist community.** This is why **the most sensible policy for the PRC in the present conditions — if, of course, its aspirations and its possibilities are to match one another — would be to devote its efforts to the development of its national economy, science, technology and agriculture; to make them help to raise the Chinese people's living standards, to meet their vital needs. The Chinese people are suffering many privations, hence such a trend in the policy of the Chinese leaders would bring greater benefits to the Chinese people and would be more highly appreciated by them and better understood throughout the world.**

Let us suppose that by overstraining its economy the PRC would nevertheless produce a few atom bombs. But how many of such bombs would in that case be pointed against the PRC by the imperialists? Would the Chinese leaders feel more secure, even if they sat on their own atom bomb? If the threat of a new war were to grow in the West, and this would inevitably occur in the event of the further spread of nuclear

arms among the capitalist states, China would hardly feel more secure than today.

Only in one's mind's eye can one put up a wall of any height and any thickness between events in the West and developments in the East. In actual reality there is no such wall. This was already true before the First World War, it was confirmed by the experience of both world wars, and in our time, when distances on the Earth are shrinking more and more with the development of science and engineering, it has become even more obvious. **If the leaders of any country, large or small, refuse to see the international situation as it is, and base their policy on the belief that only what takes place in their own house is important and that everything that occurs in other areas of the world is unimportant, this frame of mind smacks of narrow-minded provincialism and scholasticism. Such views are simply dangerous in life because of their adventuristic nature.**

The Chinese leaders abuse the Soviet Union in every possible way for having nuclear arms while the PRC has none. Can the PRC leaders honestly say that without the nuclear might of the USSR, without the might which all these years has served the interests of all the socialist countries, without the policy of peace, the policy of fettering the forces of aggression, which the Soviet Union has pursued and still pursues, China could today work in peace on her domestic tasks of economic and state development? No, the leaders of the PRC would have to admit that even such a luxury as their statements against the nuclear test ban Treaty and their rude attacks against the Soviet Union and the CPSU they can only afford because the external security of China is guaranteed by the might of the Soviet Union and the whole socialist community.

They really cannot be unaware of the true worth of their claims that "in the struggle against imperialist aggression, in defending its security, each socialist state relies above all on its own defence potential, and only secondarily on the sup-

port and help of the fraternal countries and the peoples of the whole world". It is true, of course, that every socialist country makes its contribution to the common cause of ensuring the security of the whole socialist community, and the fulfilment of this duty by each of them deserves every respect. But **an attempt by any socialist state to rely only on its own forces to ensure its defence forces which, moreover, may not be adequate in all countries, could prove to be a fatal mistake in the age of nuclear arms.** In organising their defences all the socialist countries, including the People's Republic of China, no matter how much its leaders try to prove the contrary, take into account the nuclear might of the Soviet Union, which restrains aggressive circles of the Western powers.

The Chinese leaders assert that the Soviet Union cares only for its own welfare, and in signing the Treaty on banning nuclear weapon tests "dooms the people to an age of suffering for the sake of a minute of tranquillity".

If the authors of the PRC Government's statement mean the absence of war when they say "tranquillity", [The expressions used in the August 15 statement of the Chinese government spokesman are, in our English translation, "momentary ease" and "a moment's ease," and, in the Russian translation of Hsinhua News Agency, "временное спокойствие," and "минута покоя." Here, only the word "спокойствие" (tranquillity) is quoted. — *Editor*] well, we have certainly always been and still are and will continue to be for such tranquillity. We have no need of war, just as the peoples of all the socialist countries and all peoples have no need of it. But if the Chinese leaders wish to cast aspersions on the Soviet Union's determination to go on upholding the cause of peace to the end, to safeguard the security of the countries of the socialist community — and to all appearances this is the intention of the authors of the above statement — they will not succeed in their attempt.

It cannot be effaced from the memory of the peoples that at the most critical moments, when aggressive circles brought the world to the brink of war, the Soviet Union has without hesitation applied all its international weight, its military might to stay the aggressor's hand raised over any country, whether small or big, geographically distant or close to us. This was the case at the time of the Suez crisis, this was the case during the events concerned with Syria and Iraq in 1958. This was the case during the tense period in the Taiwan Strait — and the Chinese leaders and the Chinese people certainly remember it. This was also the case during the crisis in the Caribbean Sea, when the Soviet Union protected revolutionary Cuba with its nuclear rocket might. Maybe the Chinese leaders regard all these as minutes of "tranquillity". But it can be said outright that nobody else will agree with them. These steps by the Soviet Government were also an expression of genuine proletarian internationalism, not the kind which Peking likes to talk about and which is backed by **nothing but noisy slogans and paper resolutions.**

There is yet another circumstance which cannot be dismissed: **the PRC Government, disregarding its duty of an ally and abusing the relations of trust existing between socialist countries, has embarked upon the course of making public confidential documents and information relating to the defences of the countries of the socialist community, presenting the facts tendentiously and in a distorted light. Of course the Soviet Government will not stoop so low as to take the same course of divulging information relating to the defences of the socialist states. The Soviet Government is compelled to state that after these actions of the PRC Government there is hardly anyone who will believe in the sincerity of its assurances or entrust important defence information to it. Naturally the Soviet Government will draw its own conclusions on this score.**

The statements of the Chinese leaders reveal a growing tendency to speak on behalf of the peoples of virtually the entire world, including the Soviet people, the peoples of the other socialist countries, and also the young national states

of Asia, Africa and Latin America. But **who gave the Chinese leaders the right,** the Soviet people ask indignantly, **to decide for us, for the Soviet Government, and for our Communist Party, what serves and what does not serve our interests? We have not given you this right and do not intend to do so.**

Who gave the leaders of the PRC the right to speak for the peoples of the other socialist countries? Perhaps they have asked the opinion of the Poles, Germans, Czechoslovaks, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Hungarians, Yugoslavs and Mongolians on the stopping of nuclear weapon tests, and are drawing up their statements on the basis of this opinion? No, **they have not asked the opinion of the peoples of these countries. They simply think that they can say anything that comes into their heads and claim that the voice of Peking is the voice of Warsaw, Berlin, Ulan-Bator, and the capitals of the other socialist countries.**

The actual attitude of the PRC leaders to the real interests of the other socialist countries can be seen, if from nothing else, from their assertion that the conclusion of the test ban Treaty "sacrificed" the international status of the German Democratic Republic. Perhaps the leaders of the PRC do not know that the GDR was one of the first to put its signature to this Treaty, immediately after the signing of the Treaty by the original parties? But **it appears that on the question of appraising the importance of the GDR's joining the nuclear test ban Treaty the PRC leaders measure other people's corn by their own bushel, believing that German affairs are understood better in China than in the GDR, than by the Government of the German Democratic Republic.**

Though the PRC leaders do not state this openly, the content of both statements by the PRC Government on the nuclear test ban Treaty is that not the ending but the continuation of nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water would be in the interests of the peoples, in the interests of peace. But one is allowed to ask where and

when has any people announced its readiness to breathe radioactive air and eat radioactive food? We do not know of any such statements. We also have no knowledge of the Chinese people saying: yes, let nuclear weapon testing continue, we are ready to let radioactive substances poison our blood, settle in our bones, inflict incurable diseases on us and our children and by inheritance on our posterity. We have not heard the Chinese people say anything like this.

No Leninist-Communist could help experiencing a feeling of natural disgust at this attitude towards thermonuclear war: that there is nothing wrong even if half of humanity, if 300 million Chinese perish, for on the other hand imperialism would be erased from the face of the Earth and those who survive would rapidly create on the ruins of imperialism a new, a thousand times greater civilisation. This very attitude to thermonuclear war has more than once been reflected in the pronouncements of high-ranking Chinese representatives. Even if the PRC Government makes not two but a hundred and two statements that it is longing for the prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons, that its only concern is the interests of the peoples, it will not be able to wash away the shame of staking the lives of hundreds of millions of people, including Chinese people, in a thermonuclear war. Incidentally, with the content of its latest statement against the nuclear test ban Treaty the PRC leadership only confirms that **it is still proceeding in its foreign policy from this anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist, inhuman conception.**

But **who asked the Chinese that are being doomed in advance to death whether they are willing to be firewood in the furnace of nuclear missile war, whether they empowered the PRC leadership to issue their death notices in advance?**

Another question also arises. If, as is forecast by the Chinese leaders, about half the population of such a big country as China would perish in a thermonuclear war, then how many people would perish in countries where the number of population is measured not in hundreds of millions but in

tens of millions or just in millions of people? But it is obvious that the half of mankind whom the Chinese leaders are ready to cross out from humanity would include many whole countries and peoples. Who gave the Chinese leaders the right to settle the destinies of these peoples, to speak on their behalf?

Who gave the Chinese leaders the right to denigrate the ultimate goal of the international working class movement — the victory of labour over capital — by asserting that the way to it lies through world thermonuclear war and that it is worth sacrificing half the population of the world in order to build a higher civilisation on corpses and ruins. This conception has nothing in common with the Marxist-Leninist teaching. We are against this bestial conception. We have waged and are waging a tireless struggle for the triumph of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, for the liberation of the peoples from all exploitation and oppression, and for the victory of labour over capital by methods worthy of the great humanistic ideals of socialism and communism.

If some people in Peking are ready to sacrifice half the population of their country and half of mankind, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government treasure the lives not only of half the population of the Soviet Union but the life of every Soviet person, and they are not at all indifferent to the fate of the other peoples of the world. The Leninist Central Committee of our Party and the Soviet Government see it as their prime duty to the Soviet people to ensure conditions for a stable peace to implement the grandiose plans of full-scale communist construction in our country. The actions of the Soviet Union in the international arena are subjugated to the task of preventing the imperialists from starting a world thermonuclear war. We regard this also as our internationalist duty to the working people of the whole world.

Our people do not have to borrow courage from others. When the need arose to defend our just cause, the freedom

and independence of our motherland and the great gains of the October Revolution, the Soviet people took up arms and routed the aggressors in a life-and-death struggle. No one will succeed in belittling the great exploits of our people, who have more than once in the past brought aggressors to their knees in defending their Motherland, and no one will succeed in smearing the banners of the Soviet Army, the liberator, banners that are covered with undying glory and were carried by Soviet soldiers in the years of the Second World War into the heart of Europe and to the shores of the Pacific Ocean. And the Soviet people will not flinch in the future in any trials or tests; it has everything to administer a devastating rebuff to anyone trying to infringe on the security of the Soviet Union or its friends and allies. But **no incantations from Peking will draw the Soviet Union on to the road of madness, of irresponsible playing with the lives of hundreds of millions of people.**

The PRC leaders are trying to give the impression that **their statements, which are aimed at undisguised interference in the domestic affairs of other socialist states, and in particular the Soviet Union, are motivated by a sense of "proletarian internationalist duty". It follows from their logic that the "internationalist duty" of a friendly state is to smear the Soviet Union and its peaceful foreign policy, and to arrogate the right to speak for the peoples of the other socialist countries.**

It must be said that **not a single imperialist government has yet reached the point of daring to assert that it and not the Soviet Government represents the Soviet Union in international affairs and speaks on behalf of the Soviet people.** It is not hard to guess what would happen in the world if not only the PRC Government but other states as well, and especially the great powers, were to follow the example set by the PRC Government in its August 15 statement. **Chaos and plunder would reign in international relations if any government at will started considering itself and not the**

government of this or that country as the exponent of the will of the people of that country. Should one be guided in inter-state relations by such a criterion as an arbitrary interpretation of "internationalist duty" — and bourgeois states could in their turn adopt a criterion based on their understanding of this duty — there would no longer be any place either for international treaties or respect for the sovereignty of states, or for non-interference into their domestic affairs.

In the statement of the PRC Government spokesman the claim to decide for the Soviet people what serves their interests and what does not, what ensures the security of the Soviet Union and what does not, really reaches phantastic proportions. Take, for example, the idea contained in the PRC Government statement that if the Soviet Union continues to pursue in international affairs the policy embodied in the conclusion of the Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, that is, if it continues to follow its peaceful foreign policy, "then the Soviet Union itself, in the final count, will not be able to survive". We know that **the PRC Government thinks a lot of its "warnings" to the United States Government. Quite a number of these "warnings" have been made up to date. Maybe the statement that the Soviet Union "will not be able to survive in the final count" is also a "warning" issued by the PRC, only to a new address?**

The Chinese leaders are trying to give the impression that they are also speaking on behalf of the oppressed peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and are in some way their spokesman. But what kind of appeals come from this spokesman, what kind of banner do the leaders of China want to hoist over the peoples' national-liberation movement?

The appeals of the PRC leaders smack strongly of demagogy and adventurism. They want to foist upon the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America the idea that the nuclear test ban Treaty and other steps aimed at reducing international tension interfere with the development of their

national-liberation struggle. Such rantings are a fraud. To link the fate of the national-liberation movement with an aggravation of international tension, with urging humanity to a world thermonuclear war, as the PRC leaders are doing, is like promising the peoples freedom after death.

No, the Chinese leaders will not entice anyone onto the road that ends in an abyss. It was not to have all their gains threatened with destruction that the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America pressed for independence. They want to live, to strengthen their states, to develop their economy, to create the material foundations for achieving genuine independence.

The attempts of the Chinese leaders to give the impression that they own a patent to interpret the feelings and aspirations of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are unconvincing. The incompatibility of the position of the PRC leaders with the interests of these peoples is best attested by the fact that despite their attacks on the nuclear test ban Treaty, the states of Asia, Africa and Latin America are acceding to the Treaty one after another. And one certainly does not hear from these governments any approval of the line taken by the PRC Government. Is it that the post is not functioning efficiently enough, or that the telegraph has failed, and therefore no news is coming about the solidarity of states with the position of the PRC Government on the question of the nuclear test ban? This does not seem to be the case.

The only course left to the authors of the statements of the PRC Government is to use as their trump cards the pronouncements of a few renegades who have long since lost roots in their countries and their parties, and whom Peking is trying hard to woo. In addition to this, the PRC Government can also boast of a resolution passed by the so-called "Fourth International" uniting Trotskyite groups. "Worthy" partners in "proletarian internationalism"!

The hullabaloo against the nuclear test ban Treaty is being widely used in Peking for propaganda of a Peking-invented story of a "special" community of interests of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. **Playing on the nationalist sentiments of some leaders in certain countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the Chinese leaders have ostentatiously stressed the community of interests of these three continents only, without saying a word about the need to strengthen their solidarity with the peoples of the socialist countries, with the world revolutionary movement of the working class. Such an interpretation of Afro-Asian solidarity becomes not so much an instrument of struggle against imperialism as a means of isolating the peoples of these continents from the socialist states and from many other peaceloving states. Who, except the imperialists, stands to profit from such a policy?**

As if foreseeing the present attempts of the Chinese leaders to create divisions within the international communist and national-liberation movement by dividing it up according to colour of skin, and their striving to separate the liberation struggle of the peoples from the revolutionary movement of the international proletariat. V. I. Lenin wrote: "He who says A must say B; one who has adopted the standpoint of nationalism naturally arrives at the desire to erect a Chinese Wall around his nationality, his national working-class movement, he is unembarrassed even by the fact that it would mean building separate walls in each city, in each little town and village, unembarrassed even by the fact that by his tactics of division and dismemberment **he is reducing to nil** the great call for the rallying and unity of the proletarians of all nations, all races and all languages." (Collected Works, V. 6., 4th edition, pp. 474-475.)

The Soviet Government is far from holding the view that every insulting attack of the PRC leadership on the Soviet Union and on its policy of peace, of defending the inalienable right of the peoples to free and independent development merits a reply from us. But nevertheless it is necessary to

touch upon yet another assertion of the Chinese leaders. They state that it is their lot to raise still higher the banner of struggle for the complete banning of nuclear weapons, which they allege has been "discarded" by the Soviet Union. **Excellent standard-bearers they are, pursuing a policy of obstructing even the first step on the road to complete prohibition of nuclear weapons.**

We would be only too glad if the Government of People's China would march in the great struggle for disarmament in one rank with the Soviet Union and with all the socialist countries. Unfortunately this is not so today. The banner of the struggle for general and complete disarmament, for the destruction of nuclear weapons has been raised high and is being carefully carried in the hands by all those for whom the word "peace" contains a concrete programme of action to reduce international tension, to ensure conditions for peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, and to remove the danger of a thermonuclear war. Unfortunately the People's Republic of China is not among them today.

In present-day conditions when the danger that the most aggressive imperialist forces may unleash a world thermonuclear war still exists, but when at the same time there are mighty forces in the world capable of preventing war, of frustrating the schemes of the aggressive circles, it is particularly essential for the peoples to have their bearings right in the further struggle for peace. Just as troops on the battlefield should have a clear idea of the lines they have occupied, of the tasks immediately in hand, and of the direction in which they must make a new thrust in order to develop the success achieved, so in the present world-wide struggle to prevent thermonuclear war people must be armed with knowledge of the practical significance of the successes already achieved, of what they must do next, on what they must concentrate their efforts. And in this respect the PRC Government is doing just the opposite of what is expected of the government

of a socialist country: it is trying to mislead the peoples, to deprive them of proper orientation in the struggle to strengthen peace, and hence to undermine the offensive forward surge of the peoples in that struggle.

The Soviet Government will continue to do its utmost to consolidate the unity of the countries of the world socialist system and, on the basis of the monolithic solidarity of the socialist states, on the basis of common struggle to avert the danger of a world thermonuclear war, to ensure peaceful coexistence, national independence, democracy and socialism, will continue to fight for the triumph of peace the world over.

The Soviet Government does not give up hope that the PRC leaders will once more weigh all the consequences of their present policy which is running counter to the interests of the solidarity of the socialist countries and to the interests of peace, and will switch their efforts so that the People's Republic of China may once again take her place in the ranks of states waging tireless struggle for the prevention of thermonuclear war, for peaceful coexistence, for the freedom and independence of the peoples.

全世界人民团结起来，
全面、彻底、干净、坚决地禁止
和销毁核武器

外文出版社出版（北京）
1963年第一版
编号：（英）3050—630
00230

3-E-560P